

STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA



3 0144 00406770 8

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

805
T 319
no. 9

STUDIES IN ENGLISH

NUMBER 9

University of Texas Bulletin

No. 2926: July 8, 1929



**PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY FOUR TIMES A MONTH, AND ENTERED AS
SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE POSTOFFICE AT AUSTIN, TEXAS,
UNDER THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912**

J

The benefits of education and of useful knowledge, generally diffused through a community, are essential to the preservation of a free government.

Sam Houston

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. . . . It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire.

Mirabeau B. Lamar

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| THE PARTICIPLE IN WYCLIFFE WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIS ORIGINAL ENGLISH WORKS, by Mrs. Annie S. Irvine..... | 5 |
| A HEROIC POEM ON THE DEATH OF SIR THOMAS MORE—BY D. ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM, by D. T. Starnes | 69 |
| TWO NOTES ON SHAKESPEARIAN PARALLELS, by Robert Adger Law | 82 |
| ON SHAKESPEARE'S CHANGES OF HIS SOURCE MATERIAL IN "ROMEO AND JULIET," by Robert Adger Law..... | 86 |
| SIXTEENTH CENTURY IMITATION OF "ROMEO AND JULIET," by Arthur M. Sampley..... | 103 |
| AN INTERPRETATION OF POE'S "AL ARAAF," by Floyd Stovall | 106 |
| WHITMAN AND HEGEL, by Mody C. Boatright..... | 134 |

243314

THE PARTICIPLE IN WYCLIFFE WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIS ORIGINAL ENGLISH WORKS

BY MRS. ANNIE S. IRVINE

A. INTRODUCTION

One of the most prominent earmarks of Wycliffe's style in his translation of the Bible is his stiff, unidiomatic use of the Absolute Participle, as in the following examples:—

Matt. 9.10: And it is don, *him syttinge* at the mete = *Factum est discumbente eo* in domo.

Mark 6.2: And *the saboth maad*, Jhesus bigan for to teche in a synagoge = *et facto sabbato coepit* in synagoga docere.

Scarcely less awkward, at times, is his use of the Appositive Participle, as the following examples will testify:—

Matt. 5.44: And preye ye for *men pursuyng*e and falsly *chal-engynge* you = *et orate pro persequentibus et calumniantibus* uos (K. J.: pray for *them* that despitefully use you and persecute you).

Matt. 2.14: *The whiche Joseph rysynge* up, toke the child = *Qui consurgens accepit puerum* (K. J.: *When he arose*, he took the child).

The frequency of these awkward locutions, which are clearly the result of the translator's endeavor to render the Latin constructions as literally as possible, seriously impairs not only the idiomatic quality, but often, also, the clearness of the style. Indeed, it was only a few years after the completion of the Wycliffite translation of the Bible that a revision was undertaken by one of Wycliffe's pupils, John Purvey,¹ with the avowed intention of correcting just such errors as these. In his "General Prologue," Purvey says²:—

"In translating into English manie resolucions moun make the sentence open, as an ablatif case may be resoluid into these thre

¹H. B. Workman: *John Wycliffe, A Study of the Medieval Church*, Oxford, 1926, II, p. 162.

²Forshall and Madden's *The Holy Bible Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*, Oxford, 1850, I, p. 57.

wordis, with couenable verbe, *the while, for, if*, as gramariens seyn; as thus, *the maister redinge, I stonde*, mai be resoluid thus, *while the maister redith, I stonde*, either *if the maister*, etc., either *for the maister*, etc.; and sumtyme it wolde acorde wel with the sentence to be resoluid into *whanne*, either into *aftirward*, thus, *whanne the maister red, I stood*, either *aftir the maister red, I stood*; and sumtyme it mai wel be resoluid into a verbe of the same tens, as othere ben in the same resoun, and into this word *et*, that is, *and* in English, as thus, *arescentibus hominibus prae timore*, that is, *and men shulen wexe drie for drede*. Also a participle of a present tens, either preterit, of *actif vois*, either *passif*, mai be resoluid into a verbe of the same tens, and a coniunccon copulatif, as thus, *dicens*, that is, *seyngge*, mai be resoluid thus, *and seith*, either *that seith*; and this wole, in manie placis, make the sentence open, where to Englishshe it aftir the word wolde be derk and douteful."

Wycliffe's slavish imitation of the Latin participle has been treated more or less thoroughly by a number of scholars who have made a study of the language of the Wycliffite Bible or of some portion thereof.³ Very little attention, however, has been given to the language of Wycliffe's original English works. Therefore, I have made the following study of Wycliffe's use of the participle, to determine whether or not the influence of the Latin is as noticeable in his original English works as it is in his translation of the Bible.⁴ For this comparison I have read statistically all of

³Among these are Dr. Joseph Carr, in *Ueber das Verhältniss der Wicliffischen und der Purvey'schen Bibelübersetzung zur Vulgata und zu Einander*, Leipzig Dis., 1902, pp. 92 ff.; Dr. F. J. Ortmann, in *Formen und Syntax des Verbs bei Wycliffe und Purvey*, Berlin, 1902, pp. 83 ff.; Dr. Erich Hollack, in *Vergleichende Studien zu der Hereford-Wiclif'schen und Purvey'schen Bibelübersetzung und der Lateinischen Vulgata*, Leipzig Dis., 1903, pp. 69 ff.; and Miss Erma Gill, in *The Style of John Wycliffe as Exemplified in His Translation of the New Testament*, a University of Texas Master's Thesis (as yet unpublished), 1920, pp. 27 ff.

⁴In his translation of the Bible Wycliffe frequently renders a Latin future participle in *-urus* by *to* plus a verbal form in *-yng(e)*, as in the following examples:—*Luke 9.44*: for it is *to comynge*, that mannis sone be bitrayed in to the hondis of men = *Filius enim hominis futurum est ut tradatur in manus hominum*;—*Luke 13.9*: And if it schal make fruyt, ellis in tyme *to comynge* thou schalt kitte it doun = *et si quidem fecerit fructum: sin autem, in futurum succides*

the original English works of Wycliffe as found in Thomas Arnold's *Select English Works of John Wycliffe*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1869 (designated in the examples as I, II, III), and in F. D. Matthew's *The English Works of John Wycliffe Hitherto Unpublished* (= *Publications of the Early English Text Society*. No. 74), London, 1880 (designated as M.). I have also read, but not statistically, all of the New Testament in the Wycliffe and the Purvey versions, as well as the Latin Vulgate (Wordsworth and White's *Nouum Testamentum Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi, Editio Minor*, Oxford, 1911); for the Latin equivalents of the participles found in the translated passages in Wycliffe's Sermons and for the Latin participles rendered in these passages, I have consulted the *Sarum Missal* (edited by J. W. Legg, Oxford, 1916).⁵

B. USES OF THE PARTICIPLE

In studying the syntax of the participle in Wycliffe's writings, I have followed the classification of Professor

eam. This construction is not found in his original English works. I have, therefore, not treated it in this essay, but in a separate article, "The *To Comyng(e)* Construction in Wycliffe," which is to be published before long.

⁵It has been no part of my purpose in this study to enter into the question concerning Wycliffe's share in the actual translation of the Bible, or to give a canon of his original English works,—both controversial matters that do not materially affect my present study. My purpose has been merely to compare the use of the participle in the alleged original English works of Wycliffe as edited by Thomas Arnold and F. D. Matthew and in the Wycliffite translation of the Vulgate. I may add that, while Wycliffe's authorship of some of the articles included by Arnold and by Matthew has recently been called into question, the authenticity of the larger number of the Arnold articles has never been doubted, and that, so far as my study is concerned, I have found no essential difference between the works questioned and those not questioned. References to treatises on the canon of Wycliffe's original English works are given by Professor J. E. Wells (in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400*, 1916, p. 842); a more recent discussion is found in Dr. H. B. Workman's *John Wycliffe, A Study of the English Medieval Church*, Oxford, 1926, I, Appendix C, pp. 329-335. Wycliffe's part in the

Morgan Callaway, Jr., as given in "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon," in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XVI, 1901. On page 142 he says:—

"According to its relationship to its principal, a participle is (A) independent (or absolute) when its subject is grammatically independent of the rest of the sentence, and (B) dependent (or conjoint) when its subject is not grammatically independent of the rest of the sentence, but is intimately bound up therewith."

Examples from Wycliffe are as follows:—

(A) Absolute:—*Luke 8.48: ȝit him spekinge, sum man cam to [sic!] the prince of the synagoge = Adhuc illo loquente, venit a principe synagogae; — Luke 5.11: And the bootis led up to the lond, alle thingis left, thei sueden him = Et subductis ad terram navibus, relicta omnibus, secuti sunt illum.*

(B) Conjoint:—*II.20.8: and Crist sitting, clepide þes twelve = Mark 9.35; et residens vocavit duodecim; — I.47.5: for propirte of his þrel palasie is a sikeweese groundid in synewis of a man.*

Proceeding with his classification, Professor Callaway states:—

"The dependent (conjoint) participle may be subdivided into (1) predicative (or supplementary. Cf. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 877), when the participle is joined to its subject by means of a verb; (2) non-predicative (or assumptive),² when not joined to its subject by the instrumentality of a verb. The predicative participle may be subdivided into (a) predicative nominative and (b) predicative accusative; the non-predicative (or assumptive), into (a) attributive, when the connection between the participle and its principal is so close that the two constitute one indivisible idea, and (b) appositive, when the connection between the participle and its principal is so loose that the two seem to constitute two individual ideas; or, to use the words of Sweet (§ 20), 'When the subordination of an assumptive (attributive) word to its head-word is so slight that the two are almost coördinate, the adjunct-word is said to be in apposition to its head-word.'"

Examples from Wycliffe illustrating these various uses are as follows:—

translation of the Bible is discussed by Dr. Workman, *op. cit.*, II, Chapter V. None of the writers considers the matter settled.

²Cf. Henry Sweet's *A New English Grammar*, Oxford, 1898, I, § 44.

(1) Predicative (or Supplementary):—(a) Predicative Nominative:—I.7.36: all Goddis lawe were *hongynge* on hem;—II.8.2: For lawe was *zovun* bi Moises;—(b) Predicative Accusative:—I.77.11: Joon say Jesus *comynge* to him = *John* 1.29: uidit Iohannes Iesum *uenientem* ad se;—I.13.25: Hold we us *apaied* on þe mesure þat God haþ *zovun* us.

(2) Non-Predicative (or Assumptive):—(a) Attributive:—I.3.3: not for charite þat men dampned in helle have to *lyvng* men or ellis to *dampned* men;—(b) Appositive:—I.44.32: Þe þridde part of þis mandement, *answerynge* to þe Holy Goost, biddiþ þee love þi God in al þi mynde;—I.181.10. Here many, *clepid* filosofhris, glaven dyversely.

I shall now attempt to give a detailed account of these various uses of the participle as they occur in Wycliffe's original English works. Complete statistics are given in the Appendix.

C. WYCLIFFE'S USE OF THE PARTICIPLE

I. THE ABSOLUTE PARTICIPLE

(A) *Frequency of the Construction*

Concerning Wycliffe's use of the Absolute Participle in his translation of the Bible, Dr. Carr (*op. cit.*, p. 92) says:—

"W.'s Uebersetzung des Abl. Abs. ist besonders charakteristisch im Vergleich mit P.'s freierer und idiomatischer Uebertragung. Das Evangelium Johannis liefert zwölf Beispiele dieser Construction. Von W. wird sie jedesmal wörtlich wiedergegeben, ja sogar der Ablativ des Pronomens mit dem englischen Dativ. In neun Fällen löst P. die Construction in einen abhängigen Temporalsatz auf; zweimal in abhängige *for*-Sätze und einmal in einen unabhängigen Satz."

Dr. Ortmann (*op. cit.*, p. 83) has arrived at practically the same conclusions from his study of all the books of the New Testament.⁷ Says he:—

"Als Partizipium absolutum. Dies findet sich nur bei W., während P. es in einen Nebensatz auflöst. Es ist nur bei verschiedenem Subject in Haupt- und Nebensatz gestattet, von welcher Regel W. einmal abweicht: thei dredden, hem entringe (*whanne thei entriden*) in to the clowde Lc. 9.34."

⁷See, also, Dr. Hollack's statement concerning the absolute participle in Hereford's translation of the Old Testament (*op. cit.*, p. 69).

According to Miss Gill's study (p. 47), Wycliffe translates literally all but two of the sixty-nine Ablative Absolute constructions in the Latin version of the Gospel of *Matthew*.

That this construction is altogether unidiomatic in the English language and uncongenial to the English ear, is brought out by Professor Callaway in *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, pp. 47-48, where he says:—

"In short, the absolute construction in Anglo-Saxon is a foreign importation that was never naturalized. One may go further, we think, and say that even in the fourteenth century the Absolute Participle (we mean primarily the dative absolute) was still regarded with disfavor in English. To substantiate this statement one need only compare Chaucer's 'Boece' with the Latin of Boethius or Purvey's translation of the New Testament with the Vulgate; in each of which the Absolute construction is avoided at every turn. To be sure, Wycliffe's version turns almost every Latin ablative absolute with a dative absolute, but that this was foreign to the English of the time is evident from the fact that the revision of Wycliffe did away with the absolute construction in almost every instance. That the idiom was foreign to the English of a later period is seen in this, that in Tyndale and the Authorized versions the absolute participle is persistently avoided."

In turning from Wycliffe's translation of the Bible to his original English works, one is surprised to find that the absolute construction rarely occurs. Dr. C. H. Ross, in "The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English," in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, VIII, 1893, pp. 254-302, has called attention to the fact that not a single example of the absolute participle occurs in the first volume of Arnold's edition of Wycliffe's Sermons. In my own study of all of Wycliffe's original English writings, I have found only fifteen absolute participles (eight active and seven passive). Of these only one can be traced directly to Latin influence:—

III.488.10: When þou shalt pray, entre into þi couche, and þi dore schytte, pray þi Fadur in hydde place = *Matt. 6.6*: Tu autem cum orabis intra in cubiculum tuum, et clauso ostio, ora Patrem tuum in abscondito.

The other examples are as follows:—

II.209.24: *Des two þingis gedered togidere* on what manner it be, þe first chirche is Goddis spouse.

II.247.24: And þis ȝyving of double almes, þat is pertinent to preestis, shulde be don in symplenesse, and *pryde fled*, wiþ ypocrisie (this example may be considered as an elliptical clause, with *schulde be* understood; it seems to me, however, that the phrase *pryde fled* is used absolutely, to express manner, parallel with the phrase *in symplenesse*).

III.22.10: Ðanne ben troublid þe princis of Edom, *tremblynge weeldinge* þe stalworþe of Moab = Tunc conturbati sunt principes Edom, robustos Moab obtinuit tremor.

III.107.11: he was ybounde and ybete wiþ scourges, þe *blod rennyng* adoun his sydes, þat þou scholdest kepe þy bode clene in his service.

III.202.11: Ðenkiþ wisly, ȝe men þat fynden preestis, þat ȝe don þis almes for Goddis love, and helpe of ȝoure soulis, and helpe of Cristene men, and not for pride of þis world, to have hem occupied in worldly office and vanyte, and *þei cryinge* in mennus eeris.

III.260.6: he seiþ þat he forȝeveþ þe offence of God, *God unconseilid*⁸ bifor, to whom ever he wole.

III.281.7: Ȝif a man come to benefice bi symonye, ȝe don bi his frend, *him unwyttynge*,⁸ he mot resigne it.

III.416.33: And *al þinge acountid*, þei gyven nowe to þo ordis wel nyhe als myche as þei did to hor lordes.

III.425.15: and hereby men seyn þat one frere takes mony grete salaryes of diverse men togider for one tyme, bot *hom unwyttynge*,⁸ ffor hor speciale preyeris þat þei slepen inne ben, as þei sey, better þan oþer comyne preyers.

III.468.8: But nowe, *hem turned* alle to þo worlde and pride and coveitise, men dreden lest God suffer þo fende to disseyve hem.

III.479.21: and *ȝe doyng* ȝoure bisynes upon ȝoure connynge and powere, trewe God will accept ȝowe.

M.56.16: he wolde have lettid Cristis deþ and salvacion of mannus soule, *him unwyttynge*.⁸

M.68.16: bi here wille and consent and in sum case *hem unwyttynge*.⁸

M.133.23: *alle þingis accountid*, þei han moche more tyme to slepe.

The following example seems to me to be a case of an appositive participle with a redundant subject, *we*, rather than an absolute construction:—

M.131.22: *we havyng*e liflode and coverynge, be we apaied wiþ þes þingis.

⁸For the use of the negative prefix *un-* with the participle, see Mätzner's *Englische Grammatik*, III, p. 75.

Notes

1. *A Coördinate Conjunction plus an Absolute Phrase*.—It will be noted that in four of the examples quoted above a pleonastic coördinate conjunction, *and* or *but*, connects the absolute phrase with the rest of the sentence.⁹

2. *The Absolute Construction as a Stereotyped Phrase*.—Four of the absolute phrases in the examples above consist of the words *hem* (or *him*) *unwittyng*, and two of the words *al þinge* (or *alle þingis*) *accountid*. It seems probable that these phrases had become more or less conventional expressions.

(B) *The Case of the Absolute Participle*

When a noun is used with a participle in the absolute construction, as in eight of the examples quoted above, it is, of course, impossible to determine the case used. When a pronoun occurs, however, the case is clear. In two of the examples the nominative case is used (*þei* in III.202.11 and *se* in III.479.21); in the remaining five examples an oblique case of the pronoun is found (*hym* in III.281.7, M. 56.16; *hom* in III.425.15; and *hem* in III.468.8, M. 68.16).

Concerning the case of the Absolute Participle in Wycliffe's translation of *John*, Dr. Carr (*op. cit.*, p. 92) says:—

"Von W. wird jedesmal wörtlich wiedergegeben, ja sogar der Ablativ des Pronomens mit dem englischen Dativ."

Dr. Ortmann, following the example of Professor Eienkel (in the latter's *Streifzüge durch die Mittelenglische Syntax*, Münster, 1887, pp. 74 ff.), calls the oblique case in the absolute construction the accusative.¹⁰ Concerning Wyc-

⁹Cf. Dr. O. P. Rhyne's discussion of the use of a conjunction with a dependent participle in "Conjunction Plus Participle Group in English," in *Studies in Philology*, IV, 1910, pp. 5-29.

¹⁰For a further discussion of the case of the absolute construction in Middle English, see Mätzner's *Englische Grammatik* (1885), III, p. 77; J. W. Bright's "The Objective Absolute in English," in *Modern Language Notes*, March, 1890, pp. 159-162; Professor L. Kellner's *Historical Outlines of English Syntax* (1892), pp. 125, 259; Dr. C. H. Ross's "The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English," in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, VIII, 1893, pp. 254-302; Professor O. Jespersen's *Progress in Language* (1894), § 183; Sweet's *A New English Grammar* (1899), II, § 2350;

liffe's use of it, Dr. Ortmann says (p. 83) :—

“Im Me. steht gewöhnlich . . . das Subject der absoluten Partzipialkonstruktion im Nominativ, W. aber setzt stets, wie die Pronomina beweisen, wohl unter Einfluss des Ablativs den Akkusativ, der auch, wenn er sich später, wie bei Milton, Bentley, Tillotson findet, direkte Nachahmung des Lateinischen ist.”

Dr. Hollack (p. 70) cites nine examples of the oblique case in the absolute construction in the Old Testament, and one example of the nominative. Of the latter he says, “Dieser deutliche Nominativ begegnet selten.”

Finally, Dr. C. H. Ross (“The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English,” in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, VIII, 1893) shows by his table (p. 256) that of the 188 absolute constructions in Wycliffe's translation of the Gospels (as compared with 187 in the Latin), fifty-three are clearly in the dative case.

(C) *Uses of the Absolute Participle*

As to the uses of the absolute participles in Wycliffe's original English writings, nine seem to me to denote the relationship of Time (II.209.24;—III.107.11; 202.11; 281.7; 425.15; 479.21; 488.10;—M. 56.16; 68.16). One seems to express Manner (II.247.24), one Concession (III.260.6), one Cause (III.468.8), and two Condition (II.416.33;—M. 133.23). One corresponds to a coördinate clause in the Latin (III.22.10).

(D) *Wycliffe's Rendering of the Latin Absolute Participle*

Throughout Wycliffe's Sermons and in a large number of his Exegetical and Didactic Works, long quotations from the Bible are introduced, translations, for the most part, of the Latin texts contained in the Mass Book. Knowing how closely Wycliffe followed the Latin in his version of

Dr. W. Franz's *Shakespeare-Grammatik* (3rd ed., 1924), § 660; Professor C. T. Onions' *An Advanced English Syntax* (1911), § 61c; Professor Eikenkel's *Geschichte der Historischen Englische Syntax* (1916), pp. 58–60; and Mr. H. Poutsma's *A Grammar of Late Modern English* (1926), I, p. 724. Dr. A. G. Latham (*A Handbook of the English Language*, 1864, p. 370) considers the case of the absolute participle always objective, even though it is nominative in form.

the Gospels, we should suppose, naturally, that in the translated portions of his sermons, if anywhere, the absolute participle would be found. But such is not the case. Only one of the fifteen absolute constructions found in his original English writings occurs in a translated passage, and it translates a Latin coördinate verb, not an absolute construction. Only one of the examples can be traced directly to a Latin absolute construction. These surprising facts have led me to make a study of Wycliffe's rendering of the absolute constructions which occur in the Latin texts of these quoted passages.

I find in the Latin passages seventy-one ablative absolute constructions. Wycliffe renders them as follows:—

1. By a coördinate clause (about thirty-eight times), as in I.13.6, 7: And *þei setten þer bootis to þe lond*, and *forsook al þat þei hadden*, and *sueden Crist* = *Luke 5.11: Et subductis ad terram nauibus ad terram, relictis omnibus, secuti sunt eum.*

2. By a temporal clause (about twenty-five times), as in I.45.9: and *whan þe Farisees were gedrid*, *Crist axide hem* = *Matt. 22.41: Congregatis autem Phariseis interrogauit eos Iesus.*

3. By an appositive participle (about four times), as in II.179.11: *þere cam oon rennyng bifore*, *knelynge bifore Crist* = *Mark 10.17: Et procurrens quidam genu flexo ante eum.*

4. By a prepositional phrase (about three times), as in II.19.25: and *in þe same Sabat day* he bigan to teche in þe synagoge = *Mark 6.2: et facto sabbato, coepit in synagoga docere.*

5. By a gerund (once), in I.69.12: *ffor comynge of siche signes* bitokeneþ þat þer blisse is nyȝe = *Luke 21.28: his autem fieri incipientibus.*

Note

"The Clipped Absolute Construction."—In the above discussion of the absolute participle, I have used the term as defined by Professor Callaway (see p. 8 above). Occasionally, however, a participle is used absolutely with the logical subject omitted (see Professor Callaway's *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 27, note 7, and Sweet's *A New English Grammar*, § 2355), as in this example: I.167.4: but ech man shal do good, *supposinge* þat he dwelliþ in God. Professor Callaway has called such a construction "the clipped absolute construction."¹¹ Other examples similar to this one are found in I.135.9;—II.107.13;—III.226.21; 514.27; 515.6.

¹¹Cf. E. A. Abbott's *A Shakespeare Grammar*, London, 1897, § 378.

(E) *Historical Notes*

(I) *The Absolute Participle in Old English*

Professor Callaway, in *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 30, makes the following statement:—

“The Absolute Participle of the Anglo-Saxon was borrowed from the Latin; it failed to commend itself to our forefathers and never acquired a real hold in their language.”

The various methods employed in Anglo-Saxon for rendering the Latin absolute construction otherwise than by an absolute participle are, according to Professor Callaway (*op. cit.*, pp. 36–46), as follows:—

(1) Normally by a subordinated finite verb (a) in a temporal clause, (b) in a causal clause, (c) in a conditional clause, (d) in a concessive clause, (e) in a final clause, (f) in a modal clause, (g) in a consecutive clause, (h) in a substantival clause, (i) in a relative clause.

(2) Frequently by a coördinated verb, which may be (a) indicative, (b) subjunctive, or (c) imperative.

(3) Frequently by a prepositional phrase.

(4) By a substantive and an adjective in the dative.

(5) By a verb in the infinitive mood.

(6) By an appositive substantive.

(7) By a complementary adjective.

(8) By an adverb.

(9) By a substantive in the dative or instrumental, occasionally limited by another substantive.

(10) By an appositive participle.

(11) By a noun and a verbal substantive in the dative.

(II) *The Absolute Participle in Middle English*

Concerning the development of the Absolute Participle in Middle English, Dr. Ross (*op. cit.*, p. 301) says:—

“1. In the development of the absolute participle in Middle English, two periods must be distinguished. In the first, which extends from 1150 to 1350, the construction is practically non-existent, and where it does appear, it must be looked on as a survival of the Anglo-Saxon absolute participle, or as a direct imitation of the Latin ablative absolute. In the second, which extends from 1350 to 1500, French influence causes an increase in occurrence, but the construction is still a stranger. In only two monuments, Chaucer’s poems and the *Paston Letters*, is it at all common, and this frequency is due to an

excess of foreign influence, of Italian in Chaucer, of classical in the *Paston Letters*.

"2. The presence of the absolute participle in Middle English is due almost entirely to Old French influence, though this influence is not great. In the first period of Middle English it was not appreciable, but in the second period it made itself felt by the increased occurrence of the construction and by the importation of prepositions that were formerly absolute participles. . . . Old French influence, however, was not able to hold the English absolute case to an oblique form like itself. The Italian absolute construction exercised an appreciable influence on Chaucer, but there is no evidence to show that it influenced any other Middle English writer."

(III) *The Absolute Participle in Modern English*

Again I quote from Dr. Ross (*l. c.*) :—

"As regards the development of the absolute participle in Modern English, we must also distinguish two periods. In the first, which extends, roughly, from 1500 to 1660, the construction occurs but sparingly in writers whose style is simple and English, but is very abundant in writers specially dominated by classical influence. This increase in occurrence is due to the Revival of Learning. In the second period, extending from 1660 to the present time, the construction becomes naturalized under the influence of the Restoration, and takes its place as an inherent part of the syntax. It is given to poetry, and its sphere is largely narrowed to that of narration and description."

(F) *Conclusion*

The results of this study of Wycliffe's use of the Absolute Participle point conclusively to one noteworthy difference between the style of his original English works and that of his translation of the Bible: *The unidiomatic and awkward dative absolute construction, which is used excessively in his translation of the Bible, occurs only rarely in his original English writings.* In all the 1,840 pages included in the latter, there are only about fifteen absolute participles, five of which are clearly dative, two of which are clearly nominative, and eight in which it is impossible to tell the case. *It would seem, furthermore, that instead of imitating the Latin absolute construction in his original English works, Wycliffe was consciously and purposely avoiding it; for, of the seventy-one absolute participles found in the original*

Latin passages which he translates as texts of his sermons and tracts, not one has been rendered by an absolute participle in English, and in all his original English works only one example of the absolute participle can be traced directly to a Latin absolute construction. Instead of translating the Latin ablative absolute literally, Wycliffe has used several of the same methods employed in Anglo-Saxon: he has rendered thirty-eight by a coördinated finite verb; twenty-five by a subordinated finite verb in a temporal clause; four by an appositive participle; three by a prepositional phrase; and one by a verbal substantive. In striking contrast to these renderings, we find from the studies of various scholars that, in his translation of the Bible, Wycliffe showed a decided tendency to translate literally all the Latin absolute participles; all but two of the sixty-nine absolute participles occurring in the Gospel of *Matthew* are rendered by the same construction in English.

II. THE DEPENDENT PARTICIPLE

(A) The Predicative Participle

(I) The Predicate Nominative

1. The Present Participle

In Modern English the present participle is commonly used with the verb *be* to form a progressive tense (or definite tense, according to the terminology of Sweet, *op. cit.*, II, § 2203). In this use a participle occurs occasionally in Wycliffe's original English works. In the first volume of the Sermons I have found only about twenty-seven clear examples of a progressive tense, of which nine occur in translated passages. Five of the twenty-seven participles have a direct object. The following are typical examples of this predicative use of the present participle:—

I.353.28: And to þes fyve joies *ben answeyng*e fyve vertues þat we may have.

I.116.35. Jesus *was castyng*e out a fend = Luke 11.14: Et erat *eiciens* daemonium.

In the following examples, on the other hand, the participles seem to be adjectival rather than verbal in nature:—

I.77.30: If þer keies and Cristis wille be *discording*.

I.273.14: If al þi bodi be al *shynynge*.

I.76.2: It is better and more *suyng*e þis gospel.

The present participle is also found occasionally as a predicate nominative after the verb *seem* and after a passive verb. The only clear examples of this use that I have found in Wycliffe's original English works are translations from the Latin:—

I.311.25: she *was founden havynge* of þe Holi Goost = *Matt. 1.18: inuenta erat in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto*.

II.38.23: anoynte þi heed, and waishe þi face, þat þou *be not seen fastynge* to men = *Matt. 6.18: unge caput teum, et faciem tuam lava; ne uidearis hominibus ieiunans*.

II.38.4: þei putten þer face out of fourme, to *seme fastynge* to men = *Matt. 6.16: demoluntur enim facies suas ut pareant hominibus ieiunantes*.

Finally, the present participle occurs as predicate nominative after certain verbs of motion or rest. In this use it has supplanted the predicative infinitive of the Anglo-Saxon. This supplanting, which had begun to take place in the Anglo-Saxon period, is discussed by Professor Callaway in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* (1913), p. 221. In Wycliffe's original English works I have found only four such constructions (two after a verb of motion and two after a verb of rest), two of which occur in translated passages:—

I.318.33: And þei *came hastinge* = *Luke 2.16: Et uenerunt festinantes* (or Appositive, expressing Manner?).

I.374.5: Crist *cam* to his disciplis *walkinge* on þe watir = *Matt. 14.25: uenit ad eos ambulans supra mare* (or Appositive, expressing Manner?).

I.39.24: þis Lazarus þat foure daies *lay stinkynge* in his grave.

III.26.33: þat is, þou reisinge holy writt in þe knowynge of þin apostlis schalt reise it in alle meke followers to worche þereafter, þat *lay slepinge* while men understonden it not.

2. The Preterite Participle

(1) With the Verb *Be*

In Wycliffe's writings, as in Modern English, the preterite participle is used with the verb *be* to form the passive voice, as in I.29.11: þus *was* Poul *constreyned* to crepe out of his

hegge. The passive voice occurs about 220 times in the first fifty pages of the Sermons. Since, however, there is nothing unusual about the construction, I have not judged it necessary to list the participles used in this way.

Wycliffe also uses the preterite participle of certain intransitive verbs of *motion*, such as *go*, *come*, and *rise*, with the verb *be* instead of *have* to form the perfect and pluperfect tenses in the active, as in the following examples:—

I.131.13: Crist *was risen* fro deþ.

I.147.8: and þus Crist *was went* to hevene.

With other verbs Wycliffe uses *have* to form the perfect and pluperfect tenses.

Notes

1. *Wycliffe's Literal Translation of the Latin Perfect Tense*.—One of the earmarks of Wycliffe's style in his translation of the Bible is his too literal translation of the Latin perfect or pluperfect tense, as in *John* 1.3: *alle thingis ben maad* = *omnia facta sunt*. This peculiarity also occurs in some of the translated passages of the original English works. In these passages the Latin perfect passive is rendered by the present passive about 72 times, and by the preterite passive about 76 times; the perfect passive for the Latin perfect passive does not occur. The Latin pluperfect passive is rendered by a preterite tense about 22 times, and by the pluperfect twice. Typical examples are as follows:—

II.8.2: For lawe *was govun* bi Moises; grace and treuþe *is maad* bi Jesus Crist = *John* 1.17: *quia lex per Mosen data est: gratia et ueritas per Iesum Christum facta est*.

I.319.1: þes þingis þat *weren seid* of þe heerdemen to hem = *Luke* 2.18: *de his quae dicta erant a pastoribus ad ipsos*.

II.187.34: if in Sodom *hadden vertues be done* þat ben in þe, peraventure þei *hadden dwelt* into þis day = *Matt.* 11.23: *si in Sodomis factae fuissent uirtutes quae sunt in te, forte manissent usque in hunc diem*.

2. *The Use of "Have" and "Be" in the Perfect Tenses*.—Originally, only transitive verbs formed the perfect and pluperfect tenses with the auxiliary verb *have*. In Wycliffe's time, however, *have* was regularly used with all verbs except a few intransitive verbs expressing motion (see Sweet, *op. cit.*, §§ 2165–2168).

(2) With the Verb *Seem* and with Passive Verbs

The preterite participle is occasionally used by Wycliffe in the predicate nominative after the verb *seem* and after passive verbs. The only clear examples I have been able to find in the original English works are the following:—

I.281.33: and oo leper *left unheelid* mai emblemisse many folk.

II.58.7: Cristis face, whanne it shynede as sunne, *was not seen figurid* as oures ben now.

III.9.13: My generacioun . . . *is not seen remewede*.

III.293.33: þei boþ *ben holden cursid*.

III.348.3: þe pope *semeþ* wood, and *blindid* by þe fend.

(II) The Predicate Accusative

1. The Present Participle

I have found in Wycliffe's original English works about seventy present participles used in the predicate accusative. About fifty of these occur in quotations from the Bible, of which at least forty-nine are translations of Latin participles in the same construction. Of these seventy participles, about fourteen are followed by a direct object (all except three of these occur in quotations from the Bible). Only about twenty participles in the predicate accusative are found in the strictly original parts of Wycliffe's English works; all of these except three are intransitive. I quote only a few typical examples:—

I.107.6: þis blynde man herde *þe puple passinge* = Luke 18.36: cum audiret *turbam praetereuntem*.

I.295.34: Joon biheld *Jesus wandrynge* = John 1.36: respiciens *Iesum ambulantem*.

M. 240.20: he wole not here synful *men crynge* to him.

2. The Preterite Participle

Wycliffe uses the preterite participle as predicate accusative about 155 times (about twelve times in the translated passages and 143 times in the strictly original writings). It is not found with an object. The following are typical examples:—

I.318.9: ye shal finde *þe child wlapid* wiþ cloþis and put in þe cratche = Luke 2.12: inuenietis *infantem pannis inuolutum et positum in praesepio*.

I.6.32: Here may men make *knowe* to þe peple þe *cautelis* of Anticrist.

II.129.31: whanne we han fode and hilynge, holde we *us* *paied*.

(III) Historical Notes

1. The Predicative Participle in Old English

(1) *The Present Participle as Predicate Nominative with the Verb "Be."*—Professor Callaway speaks of the periphrastic tenses made up of the verb *be* and the present participle as "an idiom common in all stages of Anglo-Saxon" (see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 221). Dr. Constance Pessels, in his *Present and Past Periphrastic Tenses in Anglo-Saxon* (1896), p. 74, says of the origin of the periphrastic tenses, "If the periphrasis is not native, the freedom and frequency of its use shows that it was early naturalized and thoroughly." According to Sweet (*op. cit.*, II, § 2204), these tenses were originally made on the analogy of the verb *be* with adjectives.

(2) *The Predicate Accusative of the Present Participle.*—In discussing the use of the present participle as a predicate accusative in Anglo-Saxon, Professor Callaway sums up his conclusions in the following statement (*The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 228):—

"The conclusion seems irresistible that this predicative use of the present participle was not a native Anglo-Saxon idiom, but was imported from the Latin, chiefly through the instrumentality of Ælfric and of the translator(s) of the Gospels."

(2) The Predicative Participle in Middle English

Concerning the present participle in predicative use in Middle English, Professor Eienkel says (*Streifzüge durch die Mittelenglische Syntax*, pp. 272–273):—

"Diese sind gewiss die Stellen, die das neue Part. Praes. zuerst an sich riss. Daran reihen sich die folgenden Fälle: Part. Praes. nach den Verben der Bewegung, bereits AE gewöhnlich: *He com etende* Lucas 11, 18. Ebenso Afranz. *venir corant, brochant*, etc., mit präpositionlosem Gerundium in der Bedeutung von schnell laufen, die sich auch wol in den englischen Angleichungen vertreten findet."

"Das Part. Praes. steht im Afranz. als prädicative Objectsergänzung nach den Verben des Wahrnehmens, Darstellens, Machens z. B. *voir*

oir trover laissier faire avoir. Auch im AE kommt *seon* mit Part. Praes. vor: *þa mænegu wundredon geseonde dumbe sprecende Matth. 15, 31*, doch ist hier, wie auch im ME der Infinitiv gewöhnlicher."

Dr. Ortmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 81–82) cites a number of examples from the New Testament in which Wycliffe uses the participle as a predicate nominative after intransitive verbs of motion and rest, and as a predicate accusative (instead of the predicative infinitive) after certain transitive verbs of perception (*see, bileve, here, fynde*) and after the verb *leve*. All these constructions, he says, are translations of similar constructions in the Latin. Concerning the use of the predicative nominative participle in the Gospel of *Matthew*, Miss Gill makes the following statement (p. 8):—

"The Participle used as Predicate Nominative in Wycliff's translation of *Matthew* is not common, there being only 13 participles used in this construction. These are all translations of Latin participles, and in most cases seem to have little or no progressive force."

Concerning the predicative accusative use of the participle, Miss Gill states (p. 11):—

"There are about 25 participles (22 present and 3 preterite) in the Predicate Accusative in the Latin of *Matthew*, all but two of which Wycliffe translates by the same idiom."

(IV) Conclusion

The Present Participle used as a Predicate Nominative does not occur very frequently in Wycliffe's original English works. In the first volume of the Sermons only about twenty-seven clear examples are found with the verb *be* to form a progressive tense; nine of these are translations of Latin participles. In three other cases, the participle seems to have become adjectivized. In one example the participle appears in the predicate nominative after the verb *seem*, and in two examples after a passive verb; these three examples are translations from the Latin. In two doubtful cases we find the participle used predicatively after a verb of motion, and in two cases after a verb of rest.

The Preterite Participle, on the other hand, appears very frequently in the Predicate Nominative. In the first fifty

pages of the Sermons it is used about 220 times with the verb *be* to form the passive voice. It is also used at least once after the verb *seem*, and four times after a passive verb. In addition to these uses we also have the preterite participle used with the auxiliary verbs *be* and *have* to form the perfect and pluperfect tenses.

It seems, then, that there is no marked difference in Wycliffe's use of the Predicate Nominative of the Participle in his original English works and in his translation of *Matthew*. The present participle in this use seems to be (except, perhaps, in the case of the progressive tenses) largely due to Latin influence; it is not common in either the original English works or in the translation of *Matthew*. The preterite participle, however, as a predicate nominative is common in both kinds of writing.

In the Predicative Accusative use I have found about 230 participles (seventy-five present and 155 preterite), of which twenty-seven are followed by a direct object. Taking only the strictly original parts of the writings, however, we find only nineteen present participles, as contrasted with 143 preterite participles in this construction. This fact would seem to indicate *that only in translating the Latin was the use of the present participle in the predicate accusative common with Wycliffe, but that he used the preterite participle in this construction much more frequently in his original English writings than in his translations*. These results agree with those of Miss Gill's study, since she found that of the twenty-two present and three preterite participles in the predicate accusative occurring in the Latin version of *Matthew*, all but two (both present) were translated literally by Wycliffe (*l. c.*, p. 11). Practically the same results were found in Anglo-Saxon by Professor Callaway (*The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 225).

(B) The Attributive Participle

(1) Frequency of the Construction

The Attributive use of the Participle is not common in Wycliffe's writings. In the first fifty pages of the Sermons, I have found three present and seventeen preterite participles used attributively.

The examples of the present participle are as follows:—

I.4.23: þat lasten in love of God to þer *ending* day.

I.3.3: not for charite þat men dampned in hell have to *lyvyng* men.

I.39.16: þe þridde was þe *stynkyng* careyne þat he quykede in þe grave.

Typical examples of the preterite participle used attributively are as follows:—

I.5.29: But þe lord was wroop wip excusacioun of þes *beden* foolis.

I.16.22: breke out in scorneful wordis of his first *conseyved* ire.

(II) Historical Notes

1. The Attributive Participle in Old English

That the attributive use of both the present and past participles occurred in Anglo-Saxon is indicated by Koch (*Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache*, 1878–1882, II, p. 70), Mätzner (*Englische Grammatik*, III, p. 76), Dr. J. Flamme (*Syntax der Blickling Homilies*, Bonn Dis., 1885, §§ 178–179), Dr. T. Wohlfahrt (*Die Syntax des Verbums in Ælfric's Uebersetzung des Heptateuch und des Buches Hiob*, Leipzig Dis., 1885, pp. 37, 39), and Dr. H. M. Blain (*Syntax of the Verb in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from 787 A.D. to 1001 A.D.*, University of Virginia Dis., 1901, §§ 115, 121, 122).

2. The Attributive Participle in Middle English

Professor Einenkel (*Streifzüge durch die Mittelenglische Syntax*, p. 274) says of the present participle used attributively in Middle English:—

“Zu attributiver Verwendung ist das neue Part. Praes. gewiss erst sehr spät gekommen. Bei Chaucer findet es sich noch selten.”

Dr. Ortmann, on the other hand, finds the attributive use of the present participle relatively frequent in Wycliffe's translation of the New Testament (*op. cit.*, p. 79). In the Gospel of *Matthew*, Miss Gill found that Wycliffe used the attributive participle about eleven times.

(III) Conclusion

In his original English writings Wycliffe seems to have used the preterite participle as an attributive modifier more frequently than the present participle.

(C) The Appositive Participle

(I) Frequency of the Construction

In Wycliffe's original English works I have found, in all, about 1,471 participles (817 present and 654 preterite) used appositively. Of this number, 336 (310 present and twenty-six preterite) occur in translated passages. Hence, in the strictly original parts of the writings, there are about 1,135 participles (507 present and 628 preterite) in this use. About 474 of the participles (all present) govern an object.

(II) Uses of the Appositive Participle

On account of the looseness of the connection between an appositive participle and its principal, the exact relationship expressed by the participle cannot always be determined. In fact, the classification in some cases must be, to a certain extent, subjective, depending upon the reader's interpretation of the context. In classifying the appositive participles in Wycliffe's works, I have followed, as closely as I could, the classification given by Professor Callaway in "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon," p. 268. According to Professor Callaway, the uses of the Appositive Participle fall under three large headings:—

1. The use in which it is equivalent to a Dependent Adjectival (Relative) clause, and denotes either an action or a state, as in I.46.21: *Þey brouzten him a syke man by palsie, liynge in a bedde* = Matt. 9.1: *Et ecce offerebant ei paralyticum iacentem in lecto.*

2. The use in which it is equivalent to a Dependent Adverbial clause, and denotes Time, Manner, Means, etc., as in I.56.22: *And so þe Phariseeis wendinge out fro þe weye of treupe, maden a conseil bi hemsilfe* = Matt. 22.15: *Tunc abeuntes Pharisei concilium inierunt.*

3. The coördinate use, in which it is equivalent to an Independent clause, and either (1) denotes an accompanying circumstance (the circumstantial use) or (2) repeats the idea of the principal verb (the iterative use), as in the following examples:— (1) Circumstantial Use:—II.86.30: *Jesus bowynge doun, wiþ his fyngir wroot in þe erþe* = John 8.6: *Iesus autem inclinans se deorsum digito scribebat in terra;*— (2) Iterative Use:— II.27.22: *And*

he answeringe seide = *Matt. 21.29: Ille autem respondens ait.*

1. The Adjectival Use

(1) Frequency of the Construction

The Adjectival Use of the Appositive Participle occurs in Wycliffe's original English works about 977 times. Of these participles about 165 present and nineteen preterite are found in the translated passages, nearly all of them being translations of Latin appositive participles.

The present participle in this use occurs about 346 times (about 154 being followed by an object), and the preterite participle about 631 times. The following are typical examples:—

(a) *The Present Participle*:—I.44.32: *Ʒe Ʒridde part of Ʒis maundement, answeyng to Ʒe Holy Goost, biddiƷ Ʒee love Ʒi God*;—I.318.11: *a multitude of hevenli knygtis, heryinge God* = *Luke 2.13: multitudo militiae caelestis laudantium Deum.*

(b) *The Preterite Participle*:—II.82.4: *it is breed maad of whete*;—I.288.28: *ech writere taugt of God is liche to an housbonde man.*

(2) Historical Notes

(a) The Adjectival Use of the Appositive Participle in Old English

In "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon," p. 298, Professor Callaway says:—

"The appositive use of the present participle that is equivalent to a dependent adjectival (relative) clause, seems to have been largely due to Latin influence and never to have gained a secure foothold in Anglo-Saxon. . . . On the contrary, the adjectival use of the preterite appositive participle is probably native; or, if first suggested by the Latin, was soon naturalized. To me this use seems merely an extension of the attributive use of the preterite participle in post-position when there was a series of participles modifying a single noun, or when the participle had an object or a somewhat extended modifier."

(b) The Adjectival Use of the Appositive Participle in Middle English

Dr. Fritz Gerike, in *Das Partizipium Präsens bei Chaucer*, Kiel Dis., 1911, pp. 10–15, and Dr. Ernst Eichhorn, in *Das Partizipium bei Gower in Vergleich mit*

Chaucer's Gebrauch, Kiel Dis., 1912, pp. 42-46, have shown that the appositive participle which is equivalent to a relative clause is frequently found in the works of Chaucer and Gower, especially when accompanied by an object or an adverbial modifier.

Miss Gill (*op. cit.*, p. 19) has found that in the Gospel of *Matthew* Wycliffe uses about ninety present and eighteen preterite appositive participles which are equivalent to relative clauses. Every one of these is a translation of a Latin appositive participle.

(3) Conclusion

In the Adjectival use of the Appositive Participle, then, we see a striking difference between Wycliffe's original English works and his translation of the Bible. In the latter, the present participle in this construction is much more frequent than the preterite; but in the original English writings the preterite participle occurs almost twice as often as the present participle in this use. Since, as has been pointed out by Professor Callaway, the present participle in this use is largely due to Latin influence, whereas the preterite participle is probably of native origin, *our conclusion must be that in the use of the appositive participle used adjectivally, Wycliffe's original English works are much more idiomatic than is his translation of the Bible.*

2. The Adverbial Use

(1) Frequency of the Construction

I have found about 282 appositive participles in Wycliffe's original English works which seem to be equivalent to adverbial clauses. Of this number, 259 are present and twenty-three are preterite. About eighty-seven of the participles (eighty present and seven preterite) occur in translated passages, so that only about 195 are found in the strictly original writings. Objects follow about 177 present participles.

(2) The Uses of the Adverbial Appositive Participle

In its adverbial use the participle may denote (a) Time, (b) Cause, (c) Means, (d) Manner, (e) Purpose, (f) Concession, (g) Condition.

(a) The Appositive Participle Denoting Time

About 110 participles (ninety-nine present and eleven preterite) in the appositive use seem to denote Time. Of the present participles about forty occur in translated passages.

The following are typical examples:—

(a) *The Present Participle*:—I.155.30: And herfore Crist, *discriving* a man þat loveþ him, seiþ þus;—I.91.7: *Jesus herynge* þes wordis woundride in his wittis = *Matt. 8.10: Audiens autem Iesus miratus est*;—II.58.31: And *apostlis, liftinge* up þer eyen, sawan no man but Jesus oon = *Matt. 17.8: Levantes autem oculos suos, neminem uiderunt nisi solum Iesum*.

(b) *The Preterite Participle*:—III.10.3: As bird of swalowe þat gredily askiþ mete, so in siike, *woundid* in sorowe, and in noye of siiknes schal I crie to God;—I.119.6: and *þei entrid* into þe man, dwellen in him = *Luke 11.26: et ingressi habitant ibi*.

Note

The Passive Participle in an Active Sense.—In the last example quoted above the preterite participle of the intransitive verb *entre* is clearly active in meaning. Here Wycliffe has followed the Latin very closely; idiomatic English would demand the present perfect participle, *having entered*, in this case (cf. Professor Callaway's "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon," p. 290).

(b) The Appositive Participle Denoting Cause

In all of Wycliffe's original English works, we find that he has used about fifty appositive participles (forty-seven present and three preterite) which seem to express Cause. Only thirty-seven of these participles, however, appear in the strictly original parts of the works, the other thirteen being found in quotations from the Bible. Objects are found with forty-one of the participles (all present).

A few typical examples are as follows:—

(a) *The Present Participle*:—I.154.19: for he slepiþ not, *castinge* fals weies;—II.110.34: But *Jesus, knowinge* bi himsilf þat his discipulis wolden grutche herfore, he seide to hem = *John 6.61: Sciens*

autem Iesus apud semet ipsum quia murmurarent de hoc discipuli eius, dixit.

(b) *The Preterite Participle*:—III.18.24: þerfore we þoru grace delyverid, synge we to God;— III.48.14: My soul fyllid of his grace, worschipiþ;— II.27.23: he, moved bi penaunce, wente forþ = *Matt.* 21.29: paenitentia motus, abiit (or Time?).

(c) The Appositive Participle Denoting Means

I find only the present participle used appositively by Wycliffe in his original English works to denote Means. About twenty-six of these participles occur, all of them except one being found in the strictly original parts of the writings. About twenty-two are followed by an object.

The following are typical examples:—

I.23.13: þei mut nedis serve him oþer wele or yvel, *doinge* wel þat þei shulden do;— I.322.33: þei done her fadris work *sleyinge* martyrís bi þer tyme;— I.275.19: *Dis fleish* serveþ to þe soule, *suffringe* as it shulde suffre.

(d) The Appositive Participle Denoting Manner

There are about fifty-two appositive participles in Wycliffe's original English works which seem to denote Manner (about forty-seven present and five preterite). Of this number, about seventeen (fourteen present and three preterite) are from translated passages, and thirty-five (thirty-three present and two preterite) are from the strictly original parts of the writings. About twenty-four of the present participles are followed by an object.

The following are typical examples:—

(a) *The Present Participle*:—I.412.26: Blessid shal ȝe be . . . whanne men shal seie al maner of yvel agens ȝou; *lying*, for me = *Matt.* 5.12: Beati estis cum dixerint omne malum aduersum uos *mentientes* propter me;—II.87.1: þei heeryng wenten awei oon after anoþer *bigynnyng* at þe elderst = *John* 8.9: Audientes autem unus post unum exiebant, *incipientes* a senioribus;— II.371.18: now *wepyng* Y seie, þat þei ben enemyes = *Phil.* 3.18: nunc autem et *flens* dico inimicos.

A number of the participles which I have classified under this rubric may be construed as Predicative, rather than

Appositive, as in I.134.28: *Petre went bi himsilfe woundinge and musinge*. These examples I have listed as doubtful.

The five preterite participles which seem to me to denote Manner, may, also, be regarded as Predicative instead of Appositive. I quote these doubtful examples in full:—

(b) *The Preterite Participle*:—III.138.26: ffor hit semes no charite to ride ageyne þin enemye wil *armed* wiþ a scharpe spere;—II.122.11: and Annas sente *Crist bounden* to þe bishop;—I.32.8: he siȝ *him lye þus hirte*;—I.101.19: Take þat is þin and go ful *paied* = *Matt.* 20.14: Tolle quod tuum est, et uade;—III.277.32: But what holy *man* in þis lif scapiþ *uncursid*?

(e) The Appositive Participle Denoting Purpose

I have found only the present participle used appositively to denote Purpose. There are about twenty-five of these participles, six from the translated passages and nineteen from the strictly original parts of writings. Twenty-two of the participles govern an object.

The following are typical examples:—

I.301.6: *Crist sumtyme constreyned men, shewing* his Godhede;—II.86.26: þes þingis *þei seiden, tempting* him = *John* 8.6: Haec autem dicebant *temptantes* eum;—I.2.12; sende þe *lazar hidir, wetyng* his fyngeres eende in water to cold my tonge = *Luke* 16.24: mitte *Lazarum, ut intingat* extremum digiti sui in aquam, ut refrigeret linguam meam.

(f) The Appositive Participle Denoting Concession

I have found only six appositive participles which seem to me to denote Concession (all present). All of them occur in quotations from the Bible. With four of them an object is used. I quote the examples in full:—

II.13.31: *ȝe havyng* ȝen seen not, and *ȝe havyng* eeren heeren not = *Mark* 8.18: oculos *habentes* non uiditis, et aures *habentes*, non auditis;—I.102.31: Ðat *þei seyng* wiþouten forþ, se not wiþinne in her soule, and *þei heeryng* þe wordis of þe parable undirstonden not þe witt of hem = *Luke* 8.10: ut *uidentes* non uideant, et *audientes* non intellegant;—II.22.24: *Crist, lokyng* on hem wiþ ire, hadde sorowe on þer blyndnesse = *Mark* 3.5: Et *circumspiciens* eos cum ira, constrictatus super caecitate cordis eorum.

(g) The Appositive Participle Denoting Condition

I have found in Wycliffe's original English works about thirteen appositive participles (nine present and four preterite) which seem to denote Condition. One of the present participles is from a translated passage. An object follows eight of the present participles.

The following are a few typical examples:—

(a) *The Present Participle*:—I.172.21: but oo firstnesse of love shulde *we* have to us silf, and to oure fadir and oure modir, *savyng* ordre of Goddis lawe;—III.474.10: See þee þerfore, prelatiſ and abbotiſ, þat han godiſ of ȝoure founders for to spend in hospitalite of pore men, and *wastinge* hem in pompe and glotonye and feestiſ of riche men, how strongely ȝe bene acursid of God (or Causal?).

Some of these participles, like *savyng* in the first example above, have lost most of their verbal force, and are almost equivalent to prepositions.

(b) *The Preterite Participle*:—I.35.21: For þiſ covenant, *kept* wiþ sorwe of synne and Goddis grace, is ynow;—I.85.12: Cristis *obedience kept* clene were sufficient to alle men;—II.120.15: And since alle þeſ failen to men, how shulden þei fiȝte *unbeden* of God (or Pred.?) ;—II.131.19. Ðiſ *passious* of Joon telliþ, *studied* wiþ oþer þre, how þat oure Lord suffride.

(3) Summary of Wycliffe's Use of the Adverbial Appositive Participle

In all of its adverbial uses of Time, Cause, Means, Manner, Purpose, Concession, and Condition, the Appositive Participle appears in Wycliffe's original English works about 282 times (259 times in the present and twenty-three times in the preterite). The Temporal use is the most common, occurring about 110 times; the Modal use denoting Manner occurs about fifty-two times; the Causal use, about fifty times; that of Purpose, about twenty-five times; of Means, about twenty-six times; of Condition, about thirteen times; and of Concession, about six times.

About eighty-seven of these participles (eighty present and seven preterite) occur in passages translated from the Bible, and 195 (178 present and seventeen preterite) in the more original parts of the writings. About 177 (all present) govern an object.

Unlike the Adjectival Appositive Participle, the Adverbial Appositive Participle occurs far more frequently in the present than in the preterite.

(4) Historical Notes

(a) The Adverbial Use of the Appositive Participle in Old English

Concerning the origin of the Adverbial Use of the Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon, Professor Callaway makes the following statements (see "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon," as indicated below) :—

(1) *The Temporal Use*.—"With the exception of a few slightly verbal participles like *being*, *living*, and *sleping*, the temporal use of the appositive participle, strange as it may seem, can hardly have been a native idiom in Anglo-Saxon" (p. 301).

(2) *The Causal Use*.—"The use of the appositive participle to denote cause seems, in the main, to be an imitation of the Latin" (p. 302).

(3) *The Modal Use Denoting Means*.—"The appositive use of the participle denoting means was in all probability not native to the English, but was borrowed from the Latin" (p. 301).

(4) *The Modal Use Denoting Manner*.—"The appositive use of the participle (present and past) denoting manner, was probably native to Anglo-Saxon; if not, it was certainly early naturalized" (p. 300).

(5) *The Final Use*.—"The appositive participle denoting purpose is mainly from the Latin" (p. 304).

(6) *The Concessive Use*.—"The concessive use of the appositive participle is likewise to be ascribed to Latin influence" (p. 304).

(7) *The Conditional Use*.—"The appositive participle denoting a condition is probably due to Latin influence" (p. 305).

Thus we see that, according to Professor Callaway, all the adverbial uses of the appositive participle except that denoting manner are due to the influence of the Latin.

(b) The Adverbial Use of the Appositive Participle in Middle English

That Wycliffe's use of the Appositive Participle in its adverbial uses did not differ greatly from the usage of other Middle English writers, such as Chaucer and Gower, is apparent from the studies of the participle in those authors by Dr. Gerike (*op. cit.*, pp. 15-28) and Dr. Eichhorn (*op. cit.*, pp. 46-54).

As for Wycliffe's translation of the Bible, Miss Gill's study shows that the appositive participle occurs in *Matthew* in the following adverbial uses (*op. cit.*, pp. 20 ff.) :—

- (1) The Temporal Use (ninety present and twelve preterite).
- (2) The Causal Use (seven present and two preterite).
- (3) The Modal Use Denoting Means (six present).
- (4) The Modal Use Denoting Manner (six present).
- (5) The Final Use (fifteen present).
- (6) The Concessive Use (three present).
- (7) The Conditional Use (three present).

It appears, furthermore, that all of the appositive participles in the adverbial use in the Latin version have been rendered by an appositive participle in Wycliffe's translation.

(5) Conclusion

It seems, then, that Wycliffe's adverbial use of the appositive participle, unlike his adjectival use, occurs far more frequently with the present participle than with the preterite. That the Adverbial Use of the Appositive Participle is far less common in his original English writings than in his translation of the Bible is indicated by the fact that in the Gospel of *Matthew* alone there are 146 participles in this use, whereas in all the 1,840 pages of his original English works there are only about 282, eighty-seven of which occur in translated passages. *We must conclude, then, that Wycliffe's use of the appositive participle to denote various adverbial relations was, to a large extent, due to Latin influence, which was not nearly so strong in his original English works as in his translation of the Bible.*

3. The Coördinate Use

(1) Frequency of the Construction

I have found about 212 appositive participles in Wycliffe's original English works which seem to be equivalent to independent clauses. Of this number, sixty-five occur in the translated passages and 147 in the more original writings. Objects are found with 141 of these participles.

All of the participles in this use are in the present. They either (a) denote an accompanying circumstance or (b)

repeat the idea of the principal verb. I shall treat these two uses separately.

(2) Uses of the Coördinate Participle

(a) The Circumstantial Use

There seem to be about 192 participles used appositively to denote an accompanying circumstance. Of this number, fifty-five occur in translated passages. All of the participles are present.

The following are typical examples:—

II.125.1: And *knyȝtis*, *foldinge* a crowne of þorn, puttiden upon Cristis heed = *John* 19.2: *et milites, plectentes coronam de spinis, imposuerunt capiti eius*;—I.273.14: *ȝif þi bodi be al shynynge, havyng*e no part of derkness = *Luke* 11.36: *si ergo corpus tuum totum lucidum fuerit, non habens aliquam partem tenebrarum*;—M. 206.7: nowe *he* þat kan best pleie a pagyn of þe deuyll, *syngynge* songis of lecherie . . . is holden most merie mon.

(b) The Iterative Use

The appositive participle is used to denote repeated action about twenty times in Wycliffe's original English works. Only ten of the participles, however, occur in the strictly original parts of the writings, the other ten being found in translated passages. All are present participles.

The following are typical examples:—

I.12.32: And *Simoun answeyng*e seid to him = *Luke* 5.5: *Et respondens Simon, dixit illi*;—I.379.1: And þus spekiþ *Ambrose*, *sayng*e comun speche of Crist;—I.377.23: *Crist spekyng*e to þes apostlis . . . seide. . . .

(3) Historical Notes

(a) The Coördinate Use of the Appositive Participle in Old English

I quote from Professor Callaway (*op. cit.*, p. 306) concerning the origin of the coördinate participle in Anglo-Saxon:—

"The coördinate participle, in both its 'circumstantial' and its 'iterative' uses, is a direct importation from the Latin."

(b) The Coördinate Use of the Appositive Participle in Wycliffe's Translation of the Bible

Miss Gill's study shows that the coördinate use of the appositive participle occurs 238 times in the Gospel of *Matthew* (232 times in the present and six times in the preterite) (*op. cit.*, p. 25); all these are translations of an appositive participle in the Latin. That the same slavish imitation of the Latin in this use of the participle is found in the other books of Wycliffe's version of the Bible is suggested by the studies of Dr. Carr (pp. 92-93), Dr. Ortmann (pp. 80-83), and Dr. Hollack (pp. 67-69).¹²

(4) Conclusion

It appears, then, that there is a great difference in Wycliffe's use of the Coördinate Appositive Participle in his original English works and in his translation of the Bible, since in the Gospel of *Matthew* alone there are more participles in this use than in all of the original English writings. In the latter, it appears, also, that the Circumstantial use is more common than the Iterative. In fact, the latter occurs only about ten times outside the translated passages. In all, there are only about 212 appositive participles which seem to be equivalent to independent clauses, and sixty-five of these are translations of Latin appositive participles. *Our conclusion, therefore, must be the same for the coördinate use of the appositive participle as for the adverbial use: namely, that Wycliffe's use of it was largely due to Latin influence, and that this influence was not nearly so strong in his original English works as in his translation of the Bible.*

(III) Wycliffe's Rendering of the Latin Appositive Participle

1. Frequency of the Appositive Participle in Translated Passages

In the Latin original of the quotations which Wycliffe has introduced into his Sermons and his other original English

¹²These authors have not segregated the various uses of the appositive participle; hence a detailed comparison with their results is impossible. Their examples, however, indicate that the coördinate use of the Appositive Participle was as frequent in other books of Wycliffe's Bible as in the Gospel of *Matthew*.

writings, I have found about 568 appositive participles (531 present and thirty-seven preterite). Since in Wycliffe's translation of these passages only 258 appositive participles occur (232 present and twenty-six preterite), I have endeavored to trace his rendering of these Latin participles to see to what extent he was influenced by the Latin in this construction. I give briefly the results of this study.

2. Wycliffe's Rendering of the Latin Appositive Participle Otherwise Than by an Appositive Participle

(1) The Present Participle

Of the 531 present participles in the Latin, I find that only 198 have been translated as appositive participles by Wycliffe. Of the additional thirty-four appositive participles found in Wycliffe's translated passages, four represent Latin absolute constructions; two, Latin preterite participles; two, Latin final clauses; and one, a relative clause in the Latin. The remaining twenty-five I was unable to trace in the Vulgate.

Of the other 333 appositive participles in the Vulgate, more than two-thirds (232) are rendered by a coördinated verb, as in the following example:—

I.131: þere was a pore man lyngre at his gate þat was clepid Lazarus, full of sore biles; *and he wolde* be fillid by crummes þat felden fro þe riche mannes bord = *Luke 16.20: Et erat quidam mendicus, nomine Lazarus, qui iacebat ad ianuam eius, ulceribus plenus: cupiens saturari de micis quae cadebant de mensa diuitis.*

Besides the coördinated verb, the subordinated verb also occurs:—

(1) In a relative clause, as in I.9.6: a wyse woman þat hadde ten dragmes = *Luke 15.8: mulier habens dragmas decem.*

(2) In a temporal clause, as in I.8.8: and whanne he comeþ hoom, he clepiþ togidre his frendis = *Luke 15.6; et ueniens domum, conuocat amicos.*

(3) In a causal clause, as in I.388.1: Heroude dredde Joon Baptist, for he wiste þat he was a just man = *Mark 6.20: Herodes enim metuebat Iohannem, sciens eum uirum iustum.*

(4) In a conditional clause, as in II.251.16: Ffor gif þou do þus, þou shalt gedere coolis of fier = *Rom. 12.20: hoc enim faciens carbonem ignis congeres.*

The Latin appositive participle is sometimes rendered by a prepositional phrase, as in the following example:—

I.8.8: and whanne he hadde founden it, wolde leien it on his shuldris *with joie* = *Luke 15.5: Et cum inuenerit eam, imponit inumeros suos gaudens.*

Occasionally an infinitive is used to render a Latin appositive participle, as in this example:—

I.62.17: Dis seide Crist to Philip *for to tempte him* = *John 6.6: Hoc autem dicebat temptans eum.*

An adjective is found a few times as a rendering of an appositive participle, as in the following example:—

II.244.23: Y preye zou . . . þat ȝe ȝyve zoure bodies to God, a *quyke oost* and not dede, to serve God bi his lawe = *Rom. 12.1: Obsecro itaque uos . . . ut exhibeatis corpora uestra hostiam uiuentem, sanctam, Deo placentem.*

In one example the Latin appositive participle is rendered by a noun (probably from a misinterpretation of the Latin?):—

II.3.36: Whos *knelere*, I, am unworpi to unbinde þe lace of his shoon = *Mark 1.7: cuius non sum dignus procumbens soluere corrigiam calciamentorum eius.*

About forty of the present participles are omitted in Wycliffe's translations, as in the following example:—

I.41.20: And Jesus spak to wyse men of þe lawe, and to Pharisees, where it were leueful to hele in þe Sabot = *Luke 14.3: Et respondens Iesus dixit ad legis peritos et Pharisaeos, dicens: Si licet sabbato curare?*

(2) The Preterite Participle

About thirty-seven preterite participles are used appositively in the Latin. Wycliffe translates about twenty-two of these literally, and introduces four more for which I could find no equivalent in the Latin. The remaining fifteen Latin participles he translates as follows:—

(1) By a coördinated verb, as in I.5.26: *De servaunt turnide aȝen* and tolde his lord þe answe = *Luke 14.21: Et reuersus seruus nuntiauit haec domino suo.*

(2) By a subordinated verb, as in I.269.25: a cite may not be hid *whanne it is sett* on a hill = *Matt. 5.14: non potest ciuitas abscondi supra montem posita.*

(3) By an attributive participle, as in I.287.14: ech *taugt writere* in þe rewme of hevene is liche to an housbonde man = *Matt. 13.52: omnis scriba doctus in regno caelorum similis est homini patri familias.*

(4) By a present appositive participle, as in II.69.29: and *he, turnynge agen*, seide = *Luke 15.16: In se autem reuersus, dixit.*

3. Historical Notes

(1) The Anglo-Saxon Rendering of the Latin Appositive Participle

According to Professor Callaway (in "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon," pp. 321 ff.), the Latin appositive participle, when not turned by an appositive participle, is translated in Anglo-Saxon as follows:

- (1) Normally by a Coördinated Finite Verb.
- (2) Frequently by a Subordinated Finite Verb (a) in a temporal clause, (b) in a relative clause, (c) in a causal clause, (d) in a conditional clause, (e) in a concessive clause, (f) in a final clause, (g) in a modal clause, (h) in a consecutive clause.
- (3) By a Prepositional Phrase.
- (4) By a verb in the Infinitive Mood.
- (5) By an Attributive Participle.
- (6) By an Absolute Participle.
- (7) By an Adverb.
- (8) By an Adjective.
- (9) By a Substantive.

(2) Wycliffe's Rendering of the Appositive Participle in His Translation of the Bible

Miss Gill has found (*op. cit.*, p. 30) that Wycliffe has translated as appositive participles all of the 492 Latin appositive participles occurring in the Gospel of *Matthew*. Dr. Carr (pp. 92-93), Dr. Ortmann (pp. 80-83), and Dr. Hollack (pp. 67-69) also comment on the extreme literalness with which Wycliffe renders the Latin appositive participle in various parts of the Bible. According to Dr. W. B. Owen, in "The Influence of the Latin Syntax on the Anglo-Saxon Gospels," in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, XIII, 1882, pp. 59-64, Wycliffe

follows the Latin most closely in translating the participle, the Anglo-Saxon version next, the Authorized Version next, and Tyndale least of all.

(IV) Summary of Wycliffe's Use of the Appositive Participle

A summary of Wycliffe's use of the Appositive Participle in his original English writings and in his translation of the Gospel of *Matthew* is given in the following comparative tables :—

THE APPOSITIVE PARTICIPLE IN WYCLIFFE

| A. <i>Adjectival Use</i> | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|------|
| Orig. Eng. Wks. | | | | Matt. | |
| | | Or. Pass. | Tr. Pass. | Total | |
| Present | | 181 | 165 | 346 | 90 |
| Preterite | | 612 | 19 | 631 | 18 |
| Total | | 793 | 184 | 977 | 108 |
| B. <i>Adverbial Use</i> | | | | | |
| Orig. Eng. Wks. | | | | Matt. | |
| | | Or. Pass. | Tr. Pass. | Total | |
| Time | Pres. | 59 | 40 | 99 | 90 |
| | Pret. | 8 | 3 | 11 | 12 |
| | Tot. | 67 | 43 | 110 | 102 |
| Cause | Pres. | 35 | 12 | 47 | 7 |
| | Pret. | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| | Tot. | 37 | 13 | 50 | 9 |
| Means | Pres. | 25 | 1 | 26 | 6 |
| | Pret. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tot. | 25 | 1 | 26 | 6 |
| Manner | Pres. | 33 | 14 | 47 | 6 |
| | Pret. | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| | Tot. | 35 | 17 | 52 | 6 |
| Purp. | Pres. | 19 | 6 | 25 | 15 |
| | Pret. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tot. | 19 | 6 | 25 | 15 |
| Conces. | Pres. | 0 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| | Pret. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tot. | 0 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| Cond. | Pres. | 8 | 1 | 9 | 3 |
| | Pret. | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | Tot. | 12 | 1 | 13 | 3 |
| Totals | Pres. | 179 | 80 | 259 | 131 |
| | Pret. | 16 | 7 | 23 | 15 |
| | Tot. | 195 | 87 | 282 | 146 |
| C. <i>Coördinate Use</i> | | | | | |
| Orig. Eng. Wks. | | | | Matt. | |
| | | Or. Pass. | Tr. Pass. | Total | |
| Circ. | Pres. | 137 | 55 | 192 | |
| | Pret. | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Tot. | 137 | 55 | 192 | |
| Iter. | Pres. | 10 | 10 | 20 | |
| | Pret. | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Tot. | 10 | 10 | 20 | |
| Totals | Pres. | 147 | 65 | 212 | 232* |
| | Pret. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | Tot. | 147 | 65 | 212 | 238 |

*Miss Gill has not segregated her examples of the appositive participle in the coördinate use.

(V) Conclusion

We see, then, that in the use of the Appositive Participle Wycliffe's original English works differ from his translation of the Bible in several important respects:—

1. *In the Adjectival Use the influence of the Latin in the original English works seems very slight except in the passages translated from the Bible.*

2. *In the Adverbial Use the original English works as a whole show much less influence of the Latin than the translation of the Bible does.*

3. *In the Coördinate Use the influence of the Latin is very slight in the original English works as compared with the translation of the Bible, for in the Gospel of Matthew alone there are at least twenty-six more appositive participles in this use than in all the 1,840 pages of the original English writings, including the translated passages.*

4. Instead of making excessive use of the appositive participle, as he does in his translation of the Bible, Wycliffe has chosen, in the translated passages included in his original English works, to turn the Latin appositive participle oftentimes in more idiomatic ways: (a) most frequently by a coördinated verb; (b) often by a subordinated verb in a relative, temporal, causal, or conditional clause; (c) by an infinitive; (d) by a prepositional phrase; (e) by an attributive participle or adjective; or (f) by a substantive. In this respect his usage in his original English works is in accordance with the Anglo-Saxon methods of treating Latin appositive participles which were not rendered literally, and in marked contrast to the policy adopted in the Wycliffite *Matthew*, where every Latin appositive participle is rendered by an English appositive participle.

D. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING WYCLIFFE'S USE OF THE PARTICIPLE

From this study of Wycliffe's use of the Participle, certain general results appear.

I. THE INDEPENDENT, OR ABSOLUTE, PARTICIPLE

The Independent, or Absolute, Participle is very rare in Wycliffe's original English writings, occurring only about fifteen times in all (seven times in the present and eight times in the preterite). Of these participles, five are clearly in an oblique case (probably the dative), three are clearly

in the nominative, and seven are in an ambiguous form. In the quotations from the Scriptures which Wycliffe introduces into his writings, the absolute participle is consistently avoided; of the seventy-one absolute constructions that appear in the Latin original of these passages, thirty-eight are rendered by a coördinated verb, twenty-five by a subordinated verb in a temporal clause, four by an appositive participle, three by a prepositional phrase, and one by a verbal substantive. In this respect, Wycliffe's usage is similar to that of the Anglo-Saxon translators in rendering a Latin ablative absolute construction otherwise than by an absolute participle, with this exception: the subordinated verb is more common in Anglo-Saxon, whereas Wycliffe prefers the coördinated verb in his original English works. In his translation of the Bible, as we have seen, he uses the Absolute Participle almost exclusively to render the Latin Ablative Absolute.

II. THE DEPENDENT PARTICIPLE

1. *The Predicative Use*

1. As a Predicate Nominative, the present participle is found about twenty-seven times with progressive force in combination with the verb *be* in the first volume of Wycliffe's Sermons. Nine of these participles occur in quoted passages and are translations of Latin participles in the same construction. The present participle also occurs a few times in the predicate nominative after a passive verb or after the verb *seem*. I have found three clear examples of this use, all translations of a Latin participle used thus. It is likewise used occasionally after a verb of motion or rest; I have found four examples of this use, two of which are literal translations from the Latin.

The preterite participle is used as a Predicate Nominative very frequently with the verb *be* to form the passive voice, both in the translated passages and in the rest of the original English writings. Of the 146 examples of the perfect passive construction in the Latin, Wycliffe has rendered seventy-two by the present passive and seventy-four by the

preterite passive. He also renders the Latin pluperfect in most cases by the preterite instead of the pluperfect passive. The preterite participle is also found in the predicate nominative about five times after a passive verb or the verb *seem* (not translations of the Latin), and regularly with the auxiliary verbs *be* and *have* to form the perfect and pluperfect active constructions.

2. As a Predicate Accusative the present participle occurs about seventy times in Wycliffe's original English works; in forty-nine cases it is a translation of a Latin participle in the same construction.

The preterite participle, on the other hand, is found in the predicate accusative more often in the strictly original writings than in the translated passages, occurring about 143 times in the former and about twelve times in the latter.

2. The Non-Predicative Use

(1) The Attributive Participle

In the first fifty pages of the Sermons I have found about twenty participles used attributively (three present and seventeen preterite). None of these can be traced to a Latin participle used attributively.

(2) The Appositive Participle

I have found, in all, about 1,471 participles (817 present and 654 preterite) used appositively in Wycliffe's original English works. Of this number, 336 (310 present and twenty-six preterite) are found in the translated passages. By far the greatest number of the appositive participles occurs in the adjectival use (977), the majority of which are preterite (631). In the various adverbial uses are found about 282 appositive participles (259 present and twenty-three preterite), of which 110 (ninety-nine present and eleven preterite) denote time; fifty-two (forty-seven present and five preterite) denote manner; fifty (forty-seven present and three preterite) denote cause; twenty-six (all present) denote means; twenty-five (all present) denote purpose; thirteen (nine present and four preterite) denote condition; and six (all present) denote concession. In the

coördinate use I have found about 212 appositive participles (all present). In general, then, it appears that in the adjectival use the preterite participle is more common, in the adverbial use the present participle is more common, and in the coördinate use only the present participle is used. In the translation of *Matthew*, however, the present participle is much more common than the preterite in all the appositive uses.

That the use of the Appositive Participle is not so common in Wycliffe's original English works as in his translation of the Bible is indicated by the fact that in the various translated passages which are introduced into the former, there are about 258 appositive participles as contrasted with 568 in the Latin original of those passages; whereas in *Matthew* there is a corresponding participle for every one of the 430 appositive participles in the Latin.

These results show certain noteworthy characteristics in the style of Wycliffe's original English works as compared with that of his translation of the Bible.

The most striking difference in the style of the two kinds of writing, I believe, is to be found in the use of the Absolute Participle. In his translation of the Bible, as we have seen, Wycliffe's tendency was to render literally all the Latin absolute constructions. The result is, as all who read it agree, a stiff, awkward, unidiomatic, and often obscure style, especially in the use of the dative absolute construction. In the original English works, on the other hand, the Absolute Participle is rarely used, occurring only fifteen times in all the 1,840 pages, as contrasted with the sixty-seven times it occurs in the Gospel of *Matthew* alone. It would seem, furthermore, that instead of imitating the Latin absolute construction, Wycliffe went to considerable pains to avoid it; for of the seventy-one absolute participles found in the original Latin passages which he translates in various parts of his sermons and tracts, not one has been rendered by an absolute participle in the English. Instead, we find more natural and idiomatic constructions, usually a coördinated or a subordinated finite verb.

In the use of the Predicate Nominative of the participle, there appears to be little difference between the original English works and the translation of the Bible. In the Predicate Accusative, however, Wycliffe rarely uses the present participle in his original English writings, except in those portions which are translated from the Latin. The preterite participle, on the other hand, is used as a predicate accusative much more freely in the original English writings than in the translation of the Bible.

In the Attributive Use, the preterite participle is more common than the present in both kinds of writing.

In the use of the Appositive Participle, again, we notice a remarkable difference in the style of the two kinds of writing. Nearly half of the appositive participles in Wycliffe's original English writings are preterite participles used adjectivally, a construction which, as Professor Callaway has shown, is native in origin. In the Adjectival use of the present appositive participle, especially in the translated passages, as, also, in the Adverbial and Coördinate uses, some influence of the Latin can be traced. But that this influence was slight in the original English works as compared with the translation of the Bible, is attested by two facts: (1) In all of the 1,840 pages of the original English works there are only 136 more appositive participles used adverbially than in the Gospel of *Matthew* alone, and in the Coördinate use there are actually twenty-six more in *Matthew* than in all of the original English writings, including the translated passages. (2) Of the 568 appositive participles in the Latin from which the interpolated passages are translated, only 220 (less than half) have been rendered by the same construction in English. In short, the style of Wycliffe's original English writings is not marred by the excessive use of the Appositive Participle, such as we find in his translation of the Bible. At the same time, however, Wycliffe seems to have recognized the stylistic advantages of this construction,¹³ and to have avoided

¹³For a discussion of the Appositive Participle as a Norm of Style, see Professor Callaway's "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon," pp. 344 ff.

the mistake of discarding it altogether. With few exceptions the result, so far as his use of the Appositive Participle is concerned, has been a pleasing flexibility and variety of style in his original English works as contrasted with his translation of the Bible, where the influence of the Latin is unpleasantly obvious.

Our conclusion must be, therefore, that in the use of the Participle, especially in those uses which were originally imported from the Latin and which had not become naturalized in the English language (the Absolute Participle and certain uses of the Appositive Participle), there is a marked difference in the style of Wycliffe's translation of the Bible and that of his original English works. (a) His translation of the Bible is marred by an awkward, unpleasant, and sometimes obscure use of the participle in imitation of the Latin. (b) His translation of certain passages from the Bible introduced in his original English works is much more idiomatic and free from Latin influence. (c) The strictly original parts of his original English works are, except for the rare occurrence of an absolute participle, even more idiomatic and pleasing. The following examples of the three kinds of writing will illustrate, to a certain extent, the difference in style resulting from the difference in the use of the Participle:—

(a) *Matt.* 28.12-15: And thei *gedrid* to gidre with the eldere men, *a conceil takun*, ȝaue to the knyȝtis plenteuous money.

Seying, Seie ȝe, for his disciplis camen by nizte, and han stolen him, *us slepinge*.

And if this be herd of the presedent, we schulen conceile him, and make ȝou sikir.

And *the money takun*, thei diden, as thei weren tauȝt.

(b) *II.144.21-26*: And þes princis, *gedrid* wiþ eldere men of Jewis, *token a counceil*, and ȝavun þe knyȝtis myche monye: *and seiden to þes knyȝtis*, Seie ȝe, his disciplis camen on þe nyȝt, and stolen his bodi, *while ȝe slepten*. And ȝif þis be herd of Pilat, we shulen gree wiþ him, and make ȝou sikir. And *þes knyȝtis token þis money*, and diden as þei weren tauȝt.

(c) *II.132.23-35*: Muse we not whanne Crist roos, but holde we stable þat he roos upon þe þridde day, þat was Sunday, to bigynne þe dai at mydnyȝt. And so men seien, þat Crist roos a Sunday in þe morewenynge, and feeride þe knyȝtis þat kepten his grave, þat his

apostlis shulde not stele him. But þes knyztis tolden to þe citee, how Crist roos out of þe grave, and how þei weren aferd forþe rysyng of Crist, þus quyk, and þe Jewis bihiȝten hem greet money, to feyne þis leesyng of Cristis disciplis, þat þei camen upon þe nyȝt, and stolen his bodi þe while þei slepten. And þes weren princis of preestis, þat feyneden þis leesyng þus on Crist; and þes knyztis weren coveitous, and token a greet noumbre of money. But þis rysyng of Crist was knowun in þe citee, and al þe lond.

APPENDIX

STATISTICS OF THE PARTICIPLE IN WYCLIFFE'S ORIGINAL ENGLISH WORKS

The following statistics of the Participle are based on Wycliffe's original English works as found (1) in Thomas Arnold's *Select English Works of John Wycliffe*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1869 (designated below as I, II, III) and (2) in F. D. Matthew's *The English Works of Wycliffe Hitherto Unpublished* (= *Publications of the Early English Text Society*, Series No. 74), London, 1880 (designated as M.). The statistics are complete for the participle of the verbs listed under the various uses, except in the case of the Absolute Participle (complete statistics of which are given in the essay above) and the Predicative Nominative Participle (of which only partial statistics are given, as indicated). The totals for each use are given under the various divisions of the essay and, for the Appositive Participle, in the synoptic table on page 40. For the Latin equivalents of the participles found in the translated passages in Wycliffe's English Sermons, I have consulted the *Sarum Missal* (edited by J. W. Legg, Oxford, 1916), basing my Latin quotations from the New Testament on Wordsworth and White's *Nouum Testamentum Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi, Editio Minor*, Oxford, 1911, and from the Old Testament on *Biblia Sacra, Vulgatae Editionis*, edited by Valentinus Loch, Ratisbonae, 1888.

I. THE ABSOLUTE PARTICIPLE

(D) Wycliffe's Rendering of the Latin Absolute Participle

1. By a coördinate clause (38) :—

binde: I.49.17 = *ligatis*: Matt. 22.13.

clepe: II.79.3 = *conuocatis*: Matt. 15.10.

II.165.29 = *conuocatis*: Luke 9.1.

II.258.4 = *uocatis*: Luke 19.13.

jaste: I.32.6 = *impositis*: Luke 10.30.

- forsake*: I.13.7 = *relictis*: Luke 5.11.
 I.395.34 = *relictis*: Luke 5.29.
here: I.388.3 = *auditis*: Mark 6.20.
leve: I.307.16 = *relictis*: Mark 1.18.
 I.373.36 = *dimissa*: Matt. 14.23.
 II.16.19 = *relictis*: Matt. 4.13.
 II.302.2 = *relictis*: Matt. 4.20.
 II.302.18 = *relictis*: Matt. 4.22.
leye: II.193.12 = *appositis*: Mark 8.23.
lifte: II.155.38 = *subleuatis*: John 17.1.
 II.201.34 = *eleuatis*: Luke 6.20.
loke: II.198.3 = *circumspectis*: Luke 6.10.
opene: I.341.11 = *apertis*: Matt. 2.11.
 III.200.24 = *aperto*: Matt. 17.26.
putte: II.14.28 = *inpositis*: Mark 8.23.
reise: II.158.34 = *eleuatis*: Luke 24.50.
sende: I.49.8 = *missis*: Matt. 22.7.
sette: I.13.6 = *subductis*: Luke 5.11.
speke: I.375.36 = *loquente*: Matt. 12.46.
steppe: I.92.29 = *ascendente*: Matt. 8.23.
take: I.341.14 = *accepto*: Matt. 2.12.
 II.66.24 = *apprehensis*: Matt. 21.35.
 II.144.21 = *accepto*: Matt. 28.12.
 II.144.25 = *accepto*: Matt. 28.14.
 II.289.33 = *acceptis*: Matt. 25.3.
turne: II.140.3 = *conuersa*: John 20.16.
wende: I.52.5 = *descendente*: John 4.51.
 I.83.13 = *ascendente*: Luke 2.42.
 I.253.10 = *egrediente*: Mark 13.1.
 II.50.20 = *relictis*: Matt. 21.17.
wexe dry: I.68.30 = *arescentibus*: Luke 21.6.
have þe fourþe part: II.10.34 = *Phillipo tetrarcha*: Luke 3.1.

2. By a temporal clause (25) :—

- be daye*: II.168.31 = *facta die*: Luke 4.42.
be deed: I.337.22 = *defuncto*: Matt. 2.19.
close: II.137.27 = *clausis*: John 20.26.
do: II.117.2 = *facta*: John 13.2.
ende: I.83.14 = *consummatis*: Luke 2.43.
faille: I.86.29 = *deficiente*: John 2.3.
finde: II.286.6 = *inuenta*: Matt. 13.46.
gadere: I.45.9 = *congregatis*: Matt. 22.41.
 II.258.31 = *accepto*: Luke 19.15.
governe: II.10.30 = *procurante*: Luke 3.1.
have: II.205.23 = *habentibus*: Luke 7.42.
here: I.388.31 = *auditis*: Mark 6.29.

knowe: I.57.4 = *cognita*: Matt. 22.18.
lede: II.192.17 = *agente*: Luke 14.32.
make: II.210.13 = *facto*: Luke 6.48.
 II.293.10 = *faciente*: Matt. 25.5.
 II.305.27 = *facta*: Acts 2.6.
rowe: II.178.14 = *naugantibus*: Luke 8.23.
see: II.135.13 = *uiso*: John 20.20.
sitte: II.235.34 = *sedente*: Matt. 24.3.
 II.293.26 = *sedente*: Matt. 2.43.
slepe: II.144.23 = *dormientibus*: Matt. 28.13.
speke: I.59.9 = *loquente*: Matt. 9.8.
wende: I.72.15 = *abeuntibus*: Matt. 11.7.
 II.24.11 = *ambulantibus*: Luke 9.57.

3. By a prepositional phrase (3):—

in þe same Sabat day: II.19.25 = *facto Sabbato*: Mark 6.2.
bi herynge: II.74.7 = *audito*: Matt. 15.12.
aftir þe feste: II.91.11 = *die festo mediante*: John 7.14.

4. By an appositive participle (3):—

fallinge: II.280.29 = *intercedente*: Heb. 9.15.
knelynge: II.179.11 = *genu flexo*: Mark 10.17.
made: I.99.1 = *facto*: Matt. 20.2.

5. By a gerund (1):—

comynge: I.69.12 = *incipientibus*: Luke 21.28.

II. THE DEPENDENT PARTICIPLE

(A) The Predicative Participle

(I) The Predicate Nominative

1. The present participles used with the verb *be* to form the progressive tenses in the first volume of Wycliffe's Sermons are as follows:—

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>answere</i> : I.353.28. | <i>preye</i> : I.363.16; 374.26. |
| <i>bekene</i> : I.368.25. | <i>shyne</i> : I.273.15, 26; 274.28, 29. |
| <i>brenne</i> : I.275.14. | <i>sitte</i> : I.132.27. |
| <i>caste out</i> : I.116.35. | <i>speke</i> : I.244.20. |
| <i>come</i> : I.7.12; 78.21. | <i>stynke</i> : I.263.11. |
| <i>crye</i> : I.75.16. | <i>take</i> : I.13.6. |
| <i>dvelle</i> : I.296.36. | <i>teche</i> : I.25.31. |
| <i>fleye</i> : I.110.31. | <i>walke</i> : I.293.4. |
| <i>hange</i> : I.7.36. | <i>wende</i> : I.34.27. |
| <i>have</i> : I.259.7. | <i>wepe</i> : I.328.7. |
| <i>like</i> : I.351.4. | <i>woundre</i> : I.32.20. |

The statistics for the present participle used predicatively after verbs of motion and rest are given in full on page 18 of the essay.

2. Of the preterite participle used predicatively with the verb *be* to form the passive voice and with certain intransitive verbs of motion to form the perfect and pluperfect tenses in the active voice, a full tabulation of statistics has not seemed necessary. For the too literal translation of the Latin perfect and pluperfect tenses, however, statistics for all the translated passages in the Sermons are as follows:—

(1) Wycliffe renders the Latin perfect passive tense by a present passive tense about 72 times:—

is born = *natus est* (8): I.313.4; 318.7; 340.17;—II.54.17; 94.24; 124.18; 236.16; 361.10.

is cast = *inlatus est* (1): II.210.14.

ben chosen = *electi sunt* (1): I.101.23.

ben clepid = *uocati sunt* (1): I.101.23.

ben distried = *consumpti sunt* (1): III.44.23.

is don = *factum est* (1): I.6.6.

ben drenchid = *submersi sunt* (2): III.19.18; 20.37.

is endid = *consummatus est* (1): II.128.16.

is fillid (or *fulfillid*) = *impletus* (or *saturatus*) *est* (5): I.306.26;—II.18.32; 104.34; 168.6;—III.15.16.

ben gederid = *congressa sunt* (2): II.242.34;—III.20.9.

is govun = *datum est* (4): II.19.27; 114.16; 140.36; 245.36.

is herd = *auditum est* (1): II.94.21.

is hized = *exaltus est* (1): III.13.16.

is lappid = *convoluta est* (1): III.9.10.

is largid = *dilatus est* (1): III.13.32.

is maad = *factum est* (8): I.1.36; 48.37;—II.7.17; 8.2; 209.13; 380.24;—III.6.5; 15.26.

be maad siik = *infirmata est* (2): III.15.25; 44.22.

is overcomun = *superatus est* (1): III.15.2.

is publishid = *diuulgatum est* (1): II.144.26.

is putt = *positum est* (1): I.333.2.

is raft = *ablata est* (1): III.9.9.

is sent = *missus est* (2): I.113.20; 147.29.

is shitt = *clausa est* (1): II.153.22.

is stirid = *concitatus est* (1): III.38.12.

is troublid = *turbata est* (3): II.115.32; 136.21;—III.22.10.

is turnid = *inclinatus est* (2): II.135.1;—III.5.12.

is washid = *lotus est* (1): II.118.17.

is worschipid = *magnificatus est* (2): III.8.12; 19.29.

is wrappid = *iratus est* (1): III.5.11.

is writun = *scriptum est* (13): I.31.33; 106.10; 112.12; -II.2.17; 11.18; 13.8; 49.25; 106.33; 115.9; 136.33, 37; 277.20; 278.34.

The Latin perfect passive is rendered by the preterite passive tense about 76 times:—

was born = *natus est* (5): I.339.28; -II.277.22, 23, 24; 306.18.

was clensid = *mundatus est* (1): II.74.28.

was clepid = *uocatus est* (1): I.336.20.

was clopid = *uestitus est* (1): II.3.22.

was closid = *clausus est* (1): II.74.23.

were confusid = *conturbati sunt* (1): II.306.13.

was disturblid = *turbatus est* (2): I.340.20; 363.28.

was don = *factum est* (6): I.76.19; -II.130.11; 133.20; 135.2; 187.27; 282.32.

was don on þe crosse = *crucifixatus est* (1): II.131.15.

was endid = *consummatus est* (1): I.336.19.

were fillid (or *fulfillid*) = *repleti* (or *impleti*) *sunt* (6): I.345.31; -II.9.29; 75.4; 114.13; 198.5; 305.32.

was found = *inuentum est* (1): II.293.8.

was gederid = *congressa est* (1): II.34.11.

was ȝovun = *data est* (or *tradita est*) (2): II.8.2; 17.36.

was led = *ductus est* (1): I.109.10.

was maad = *factum est* (19): I.86.24; 293.18; -II.9.25; 10.1; 11.7; 21.9; 44.27; 56.29; 58.3; 74.25; 105.22; 106.34; 107.32; 116.4; 132.9, 16; 204.23; 227.26; 281.3.

was moved = *commota est* (1): II.49.21.

was opened = *apertum est* (2): I.365.5; -II.135.5.

was picchid on þe crosse = *crucifixatus est* (1): II.132.18.

was put (or *puttid*) = *positus est* (2): II.309.10; 346.32.

was restorid = *restituta est* (3): II.22.26; 193.15; 198.4.

was said = *dictum est* (6): I.319.6; 327.24; 328.6; -II.10.5; 40.31; 345.15.

was sent = *missus est* (2): I.353.35; -II.74.25.

was shewid = *manifestus* (or *ostensus*) *est* (2): II.138.18; 143.23.

was shut = *clausus est* (1): I.293.26.

was traied = *traditus est* (1): I.306.24.

was transfigurid = *transfiguratus est* (1): II.58.2.

was troublid = *turbatus est* (1): I.355.1.

were wrappid = *irati sunt* (1): III.21.25.

was writtun = *scriptum est* (2): I.111.11; -II.89.34.

The Latin pluperfect passive is rendered by the preterite passive tense about 22 times:—

was bildid = *aedificata erat* (1): II.75.7.

was bounden = *ligata erat* (1): II.99.21.

were don = *facta erant* (or *fuerant*) (2): II.144.20; 146.5.
was fillid = *impleta esset* (1): II.305.21.
was gird = *praecincta erat* (1): II.118.9.
was groundid = *fundata erat* (1): II.210.15.
was maad = *factum erat* (4): I.82.13; -II.57.1; 269.8; 306.12.
was nourishid = *nutritus erat* (1): II.17.30.
was putt = *positum erat* (3): II.130.17; 132.19; 139.29.
was seen = *uisus erat* (1): II.143.22.
was seid = *dictum erat* (1): I.319.1.
were shitt = *clausae erant* (1): I.133.38.
was spoken = *dictum erat* (1): II.195.28.
was writtun = *scriptum erat* (3): I.340.33; -II.127.18, 21.

The Latin pluperfect passive tense is rendered by the pluperfect passive tense twice:—

hadde ben don = *factae essent* (2): II.187.30, 34.

(II) The Predicate Accusative

1. The verbs after which the present participle is found in the predicative accusative use are the following:—

biholde (1): I.295.34.
finde (10): I.83.33^{a, b, c}; 99.16; 276.26; -II.88.23^{a, b}; 98.14; 408.30. - III.34.33.
gete (1): I.348.3.
have (7): I.193.10; -II.65.18; 110.20; 319.4; -III.40.29, 30; -M.246.25.
here (5): I.107.6; -II.306.14; -M.240.18^{a, b}, 20.
holde (1): I.186.3.
leve (2): I.8.26; 25.9.
make (3): II.283.2; -M.359.29^{a, b}.
see (39): I.34.14; 59.26; 77.11; 81.29^{a, b}; 99.3; 131.29; 139.30; 184.32; 186.18; 296.11; 298.4; 301.26; 302.17; 307.13; 374.6; 395.21; - II.14.32; 15.12; 44.29, 32; 50.16; 56.23; 57.33; 92.2^{a, b}; 95.25; 110.36; 129.7; 139.29, 34; 182.16; 193.14; 204.18; 396.18; 405.9; -III.9.6; 89.3.
shewe (1): III.7.36.

2. The verbs after which the preterite participle is found in the predicate accusative are the following:—

feyne (2): I.397.27; -III.293.27.
finde (2): I.318.9; -II.145.20.
have (36): I.5.10; 196.30; 236.1, 14; 254.16; 191.10; 279.8; 291.6; 313.2; 374.33; 318.9^{a, b, c}; -II.51.26; 74.31; 124.32; 191.10; -III.307.5; - M.15.31; 49.7; 75.10; 76.12; 78.7; 117.13; 190.23; 193.16; 234.31; 236.14^{a, b}; 246.12^{a, b}; 257.14, 32; 302.5, 22, 33; 320.20.
here (2): III.293.15, 17.
holde (37): I.13.25; 16.2; 225.23; 237.28; 247.9; 269.5; 310.10; 407.15; -II.129.29, 31; 249.19; 267.14; 370.34; -III.126.38; 236.16;

295.13; 302.14, 15; 347.10; 433.27;—M.127.21; 225.12; 227.4; 248.27; 380.18; 387.34; 388.12, 16; 389.9; 412.7; 413.34, 36; 414.16; 423.4; 440.30; 448.24; 451.8.

kepe (4): M.129.27^{a, b}; 149.15; 211.19.

leve (19): I.235.36;—III.42.14; 44.4; 450.17; 478.32;—M.32.5, 8, 13; 38.13^{a, b, c}; 90.18; 117.10; 122.6; 135.18; 149.21; 176.6; 178.21, 27; 277.1, 2; 433.15.

make (25): I.6.32; 140.19; 205.12; 373.21; 393.6; 406.5^{a, b};—II.171.29; 188.36; 318.17; 372.23;—III.5.16; 6.31, 32; 153.3; 301.6; 486.8;—M.109.25; 255.6^{a, b}; 307.36; 423.20; 427.7; 429.3; 446.18; 457.32; 467.10.

pronounse (1): M.36.15.

prove (1): M.75.5.

see (10): II.135.10; 138.11; 143.26, 29, 30; 146.4;—III.102.25; 152.31, 32;—M.41.10.

suffre (5): M. 69.18^{a, b}, 20; 240.7; 251.2.

(B) *The Attributive Participle*

The statistics for the present participle used attributively in the first 50 pages of Wycliffe's Sermons are given on page 24 of the essay above. It has not seemed necessary to give full statistics for the preterite participle in this use.

(C) *The Appositive Participle*

1. *The Adjectival Use*

(a) The present participle of the following verbs is found in the adjectival use:—

abide (1): II.56.7.

accorde (3): III.57.3; 121.19; 195.15.

accuse (1): III.483.34.

adde (1): III.78.16.

answere (5): I.44.4, 32; 254.9;—II.143.18; 199.8.

apere (1): M.380.1.

aspie (1): III.135.24.

assente (2): M.256.27; 267.3.

assoile (1): III.256.29.

authorize (1): III.484.17.

axe (1): III.472.14.

be (3): III.468.19; 485.18, 22.

bere (2): M.12.29; 393.26.

berye (1): II.167.23.

bete (1): II.258.22.

bidde (1): M.48.18.

bigge (1): II.298.5.

bihete (1): III.193.24.

- bilonge* (1): M.379.22.
bitake (1): III.479.29.
bitraie (1): III.386.15.
brenne (3): II.65.7; 310.11;—III.293.29.
bringe (4): II.145.12; 243.6;—III.78.17; 208.15.
chese (1): I.155.27.
clense (2): M.100.4^b; 172.23.
clepe (3): III.35.10, 15;—M.293.3.
clowte (1): III.441.26.
come (10): I.186.28;—II.154.5; 165.10; 297.12, 16; 305.28;—III.28.29; 77.21; 226.21; 474.5.
conseile (1): III.514.31.
conspire (1): III.515.12.
continue (2): III.378.11; 494.24.
curse (2): III.324.2; 465.34.
crye (3): III.180.29; 481.4;—M.231.15.
dedeyne (1): II.268.17.
delyvere (1): III.49.36.
deme (1): III.14.30.
derke (1): III.135.24.
disceyve (1): M.154.7.
dispende (1): III.464.21.
dispense (1): M.224.17.
do (9): II.118.31;—III.193.16; 214.23; 396.27; 462.4, 29; 475.32; 476.10;—M.227.13.
drede (1): III.88.28.
dwelle (5): I.200.35;—III.28.9; 221.15; 229.1; 514.14.
ensaumple (1): I.5.35.
entre (1): III.391.33.
excuse (1): III.297.31.
expowne (1): II.155.11.
falle (3): II.78.22; 282.29;—III.161.9.
faste (1): I.18.1.
feyne (1): III.154.30.
figzte (3): III.29.4; 53.29; 520.9.
flee (2): II.227.6;—III.35.11.
followe (1): M.444.15.
forbede (1): III.189.23.
gadere (2): I.287.7;—M.248.14.
gete (1): M.224.17.
give (7): II.127.10;—III.189.22; 283.6; 325.3; 477.6; 494.25;—M.12.35.
go (3): I.252.35; 302.15;—III.455.35.
graunte (1): III.8.6.
grounde (1): III.466.25.
growe (1): I.102.23 (or Modal?).

- halowe* (1): III.8.4.
have (17): I.178.27 (or Modal?);-II.161.14; 183.30; 271.35;-III.24.9; 45.2; 107.17; 194.14; 227.26; 305.2; 311.31; 477.2, 20; 479.8;-M.19.24; 278.30.
helpe (1): III.494.27.
herie (1): I.318.11.
hiȝe (1): III.414.25.
holde (3): III.47.3; 322.10;-M.222.26.
honge (1): M.316.10.
hope (1): III.193.13.
joie (1): II.271.32.
kepe (2): I.317.29;-M.153.28.
knele (2): II.179.12;-III.322.21.
knocke (1): II.153.23.
knowe (2): II.247.21;-III.10.32.
laste (2): III.419.27;-M.348.15.
lede (1): M.153.2.
lette (1): M.159.2.
leve (6): II.127.9; 292.11; 321.26; 449.17;-M.224.16; 381.22.
loke (3): II.25.29;-III.512.6;-M.41.3.
longe (1): M.370.27.
love (2): III.29.21;-M.440.2 (or Causal?).
lye (3): I.1.29; 46.21;-III.58.22.
lyve (14): II.213.12; 312.9;-III.12.21^{a, b}, 23^{a, b}, 24; 31.31; 126.5; 221.15; 288.35; 514.4;-M.49.9; 198.29.
make (7): I.32.10; 298.5;-II.318.17; 398.5;-III.318.17; 398.6; 417.33.
mende (1): III.417.33.
meynteyne (1): III.276.2.
move (1): III.64.20.
mynstere (2): II.456.31; 494.10.
myspende (1): M.224.14.
nurishe (1): II.276.34.
offre (2): III.472.3, 6.
outwitte (1): III.307.22.
passe (6): I.30.22; 151.30; 295.34; 318.18;-III.21.1; 94, 3.
plese (1): III.188.8.
praye (1): III.105.31.
preche (4): III.311.32; 394.3; 494.26;-M.27.6.
preise (1): M.223.23^a.
presente (1): III.318.18.
purpose (1): M.365.20.
putte (4): III.455.37; 461.34; 462.30; 512.5.
rebelle (1): III.516.33.
receyve (2): III.472.5;-M.109.18.
regne (1): M.71.9.
rende (1): III.441.26.

- renne* (2): II.45.21; 179.11.
reste (1): II.139.5.
reverse (1): M.368.33.
ringe (1): III.520.2.
rise (1): II.329.24.
robbe (1): M.173.18.
see (9): III.8.5; 70.4; 78.15; 455.37; 477.9; 478.3; 481.24; 487.30; 494.9.
seie (4): II.58.27; 318.11; -III.42.4; -M.3.16.
seke (1): M.171.31.
selle (1): M.166.30.
sende (1): M.41.2.
serve (2): M.42.24; 227.14^a.
shewe (2): III.466.25; -M.117.31.
shine (1): II.65.7.
shryve (1): II.65.7.
sitte (3): I.287.8; -II.309.8; -III.23.29.
siye (1): M.100.14.
slee (1): III.135.2.
slepe (1): III.53.28.
speke (6): II.58.8; 276.33; 285.20 (or Temp.); 189.23; 517.17.
springe (1): II.84.9.
stire (1): III.324.12.
stonde (9): I.30.18; 39.22; 363.17; -II.87.2; 398.22; 346.4; 465.29; 479.18; -M.299.5.
stryve (1): M.371.5.
sue (7): I.169.21; 360.25; -II.55.20; 247.14; 337.23; 383.15; -M.163.1.
swere (1): III.84.28.
swollowe (2): M.100.13; 172.24.
take (4): II.47.33; -III.449.16; 512.7; 517.15 (or Temp.).
teche (13): III.189.24; 322.29; 471.1; 493.29; -M.27.7; 51.3; 137.30; 153.16; 175.2; 211.34; 267.13; 376.32; 387.33.
telle (2): II.123.23; 243.6.
traveile (2): I.374.21; -M.15.34.
trespasse (2): III.516.34; -M.130.24.
trowe (1): II.276.34.
tryste (1): III.455.19.
turne (1): III.29.20.
visite (1): III.494.27.
wake (1): III.317.29.
walke (1): III.517.28.
waste (1): M.434.22.
waundre (4): I.286.9; -M.299.22; 308.28; 309.13.
wawe (1): I.72.20.
wene (2): III.40.36; 386.29.

whirle (1): I.30.22.
wille (3): III.220.17; 379.22; 435.8.
witte (1): M.227.14^b.
wipdrawe (1): III.519.34.
wipstonde (1): III.214.33.
witnesse (2): III.308.15; 493.29.
wone (2): III.29.30; 43.31.
worschippe (5): III.455.32, 35; 462.27, 30; 464.21.
write (1): M.267.13^a.
wrote (= *root*) (1): III.315.3.
yelde (2): III.393.12, 13.

(b) The preterite participle of the following verbs is found in the adjectival use:—

accurse (1): M.378.27.
alarge (1): I.11.16.
amorteise (1): M.139.36.
annexe (2): III.313.25; 477.16.
applye (1): III.441.28.
appreve (1): M.388.33.
appropre (9): III.153.7; 216.28; 402.32; 424.14;—M.225.17; 285.30; 341.32; 419.27; 422.1.
araye (2): M.168.8; 249.26.
associe (1): III.329.22.
axe (1): III.334.22.
bere (6): II.99.7;—III.77.3; 79.13, 15; 297.29;—M.229.23.
berye (1): M.271.7.
bigete (1): III.77.4.
bihete (3): I.344.20; 363.22;—M.264.24.
binde (2): II.356.26;—III.60.31.
blabere (1): III.262.22.
blende (1): M.77.22.
blynde (1): III.495.28.
breke (1): M.7.20.
brynge (23): I.309.33;—II.226.6; 287.28; 318.34;—III.217.5; 302.8; 306.5; 310.19, 21; 318.30; 520.17;—M.31.22; 68.36; 91.31; 262.2; 272.31; 273.2; 333.7; 383.2; 427.11; 446.30; 448.10; 450.28.
bye (1): M.279.19.
caste (2): I.308.21;—III.19.26.
charge (2): III.87.21; 274.21.
chese (1): II.255.13.
clepe (6): I.4.25; 181.10; 271.8; 265.29; 296.11; 515.24.
clope (1): III.47.2.
cloute (2): I.4.35;—II.147.11.
comaunde (6): III.217.32; 221.13;—M.127.22; 131.21; 150.17; 231.1.
come (1): II.254.6.

- conclude* (1): I.279.33.
conferme (4): I.8.15; -II.345.35; -III.238.18; -M.567.7.
confesse (5): III.253.14; 257.1; 260.25; -M.333.16, 33.
conteyne (1): III.444.4.
contynue (1): M.137.23.
converte (1): M.125.7.
crepe (3): III.60.22; 230.31; 239.31.
crye (1): III.327.17.
curse (5): III.273.13; 328.1; 335.28; 468.32; 476.1.
dampne (10): I.2.22; 3.2; -II.183.22; -III.189.30; 315.31; -M.49.27;
73.34; 105.32; 270.1, 8.
declare (1): III.98.32.
deefe (1): I.31.6.
delyvere (1): III.59.4.
departe (4): I.27.28; 225.30; -III.134.10; 407.13.
disseyve (3): I.105.12; -II.388.14; -M.131.30.
disturble (1): II.136.20.
do (38): I.47.34, 36; -II.75.10; 100.15; 199.15; 202.28; 400.26; -
III.30.26; 214.21; 248.19; 253.32; 261.8; 281.6; 284.17, 18; 336.27;
380.32; 443.21; 248.19; 253.32; 261.8; 281.6; 284.17, 18; 336.27; 380.32;
443.21; 449.21, 23; 451.9; 461.27; -M.17.25; 18.3; 35.22; 48.24, 26;
64.22; 151.12; 207.6; 214.28; 233.6, 7; 239.1; 241.3; 335.13; 338.26;
436.30.
dowe (2): M.124.14; 421.3.
drawe (1): M.279.18.
dreme (1): III.262.15.
dryve (3): III.60.22; 230.33; -M.123.33^b.
emprisone (1): M.102.31.
ende (1): I.21.27.
endowe (1): M.375.30.
endure (1): M.130.12.
ensaumple (6): III.217.31; -M.119.3; 127.22^b; 136.9; 225.24;
245.11^b.
ensege (2): I.30.25, 26.
enjoyne (1): M.161.12.
entayle (2): M.390.20; 391.5.
falle (2): M.214.11; 272.34.
fede (1): M.420.17.
feyne (6): I.15.6; 16.2; -III.271.13; 422.32; -M.278.12; 272.34.
figure (1): II.169.2.
filie (2): III.29.30, 31.
forme (1): II.164.33.
forsake (1): II.301.33.
forswere (1): III.300.21.
foule (1): III.29.31.

founde (30): I.26.28; 28.6; 29.4; 285.19; 286.13, 18, 22, 23; 297.23; -III.147.31; 358.25; 367.2; 448.22, 29; 449.29; 451.5; 458.30; 466.19; 509.8; -M.2.7, 9; 125.23; 169.15; 235.17; 255.32; 276.25; 279.27; 280.2; 303.6; 467.19.

fulfille (1): II.151.16.

gadere (5): I.254.7; -II.144.21; -III.433.36; -M.235.17^b; 433.28.

gete (6): III.234.7; 519.15; -M.177.6; 248.9; 259.2; 387.21.

joyne (3): I.251.24; 275.6; -M.337.5^a.

kepe (5): III.112.32; 392.33; 509.12; 510.12; 510.14; -M.231.27.

kevere (1): M.20.18.

knowe (2): III.486.16; -M.279.29.

knytte (2): I.287.18; -M.344.30.

lede (3): I.186.28; -III.519.13; -M.293.5.

leve (3): I.281.33; -III.6.36; 245.25.

lifte (1): III.145.25.

lizte (1): I.271.25.

lose (1): M.30.13.

love (1): II.258.4.

make (111): I.82.4; 87.26; 130.17; -II.169.3; 239.13^{a, b}; 275.22; 280.13; 302.14; 303.17; 347.22; 380.35; 382.32; 396.32; -III.36.5; 77.2^{a, b}, 20^{a, b}; 79.15, 17; 83.34; 122.24; 159.13; 190.34; 200.16; 216.12; 221.14; 261.32; 280.19; 283.25; 284.5; 295.19; 300.16; 301.30; 305.22; 333.9; 342.9; 349.1; 369.22; 381.3; 382.34; 422.26; 448.20, 21; 449.16, 18, 20; 460.32; 463.13; 482.31; 509.6, 13; 511.20; 512.14; 517.32; -M.3.7; 17.4; 19.13; 38.28; 49.20, 21; 82.16; 89.3, 12, 15; 95.3; 103.3; 117.3; 122.2; 125.24, 28; 126.3, 4; 127.7; 131.8; 145.21; 150.18; 151.4; 155.31; 157.19; 158.8; 160.15; 190.27; 193.17; 201.34; 202.10; 206.24; 220.8, 11; 221.2, 3; 223.23; 224.3, 18; 235.8, 28; 236.21; 253.9; 269.16; 276.12; 281.20; 320.6; 321.31; 328.6; 337.5; 444.16; 462.1; 469.10.

mende (1): III.426.14.

meynteyne (5): III.271.9; -M.61.31; 137.28; 279.18; 437.1.

mortifye (1): III.347.18.

move (3): I.307.26; -II.137.17; 142.32.

multiplie (1): III.32.26.

mynstre (5): M.377.14, 30, 31, 33; 387.34.

occupie (1): III.315.9.

offre (1): III.409.31.

ordeyne (14): II.261.28; 324.37; -III.188.28; 207.27; 256.26; 393.4; 412.7; 480.25; 492.27; -M.57.33; 112.31; 119.6; 251.27; 333.4.

overcome (1): II.289.37.

passe (2): I.363.12; -II.311.12.

peynte (1): III.463.30.

plante (1): II.207.32.

practice (1): I.213.31.

preserve (1): III.262.21.

proffer (1): M.377.24.

- propre* (4): I.236.24;—III.62.33; 199.7; 215.31.
prynte (3): I.31.23;—II.298.20;—III.84.31.
purchase (1): M.287.33.
purge (1): II.239.10.
putte (6): I.41.28; 318.34;—III.273.10;—M.42.3; 154.6; 243.10.
ravisshe (1): III.475.28.
receyve (2): III.471.10;—M.87.28.
reise (2): III.27.8; 399.16.
reprove (1): III.411.31.
reule (2): III.124.11; 469.17.
see (1): III.173.14.
sele (2): III.377.33;—M.348.7.
selle (1): M.97.28.
sende (10): I.4.28; 287.6, 17; 324.13; 296.1;—III.36.4; 273.12; 297.18;—M.20.12; 204.5.
seye (10): I.349.35;—II.398.2; 399.27;—III.53.6, 7; 58.7; 171.37; 260.26; 424.24;—M.253.13.
sette (4): III.223.21; 293.18;—M.232.3; 278.4.
shewe (3): II.312.13;—III.53.27; 178.19.
singe (1): III.61.7.
slee (1): I.322.35.
slyde (2): I.30.21; 52.19.
smyte (1): M.378.27b.
specife (1): M.370.34.
spile (1): M.122.31.
stire (1): M.123.33c.
stele (2): M.49.26; 269.29.
stoppe (1): II.156.19.
strewe (1): III.415.25.
suffre (2): III.30.26;—M.353.26.
swere (2): III.294.12;—M.60.33.
take (13): II.86.22; 263.11; 399.10; 347.21;—III.47.21; 343.28; 415.5 (or Temp.?); 470.32, 34; 493.4; 509.9;—M.427.24; 428.20.
teche (12): I.288.28;—III.221.13; 273.14; 274.5; 520.19;—M.89.15; 131.21; 157.12; 222.34; 245.11; 260.2; 428.22.
telle (1): II.396.17.
touche (2): III.481.19, 20.
transfigure (6): III.459.7; 470.12;—M.99.4; 144.28; 145.10; 171.21.
traveile (1): I.205.13.
turne (2): III.173.11;—M.88.10.
undirstonde (1): II.319.37.
ungrounde (2): III.235.18;—M.38.20.
unmake (1): III.75.23.
use (3): III.294.13;—M.112.18; 443.3.
waste (1): III.92.11.
wedde (1): III.224.15.

wlappe (3): III.60.22; 495.29;—M.123.33.

wrappe (2): III.150.23; 230.32.

write (5): I.256.1;—II.344.8; 346.6;—M.37.34; 336.25.

2. The Adverbial Use

(1) The Appositive Participle Denoting Time

(a) The present participle of the following verbs seems to be used appositively to denote time:—

abide (1): III.102.10.

absteyne (1): III.5.21.

bigge (1): III.265.9.

biginne (1): II.380.34.

biholde (2): II.75.23;—M.393.27.

cause (1): M.145.2 (or Means?).

come (1): II.145.21.

conspire (1): M.130.27.

declare (1): III.98.36.

die (1): III.8.21.

disceyve (1): M.72.27^a.

discryve (2): I.155.30;—II.159.25.

dispeire (1): III.8.17.

do (1): III.491.1.

drawe (1): II.138.10.

dwelle (1): I.156.22.

figure (1): M.371.27.

forsake (1): III.29.34.

go (2): II.141.19; 177.20.

gyve (2): III.311.30;—M.72.26.

have (2): III.92.24;—M.184.21.

here (7): I.91.7;—II.58.29; 63.35; 86.34; 97.19; 110.31; 143.32.

kepe (3): I.26.11;—III.453.17; 510.29.

knele (2): II.146.4;—M.172.31.

knocke (1): M.173.1.

lede (1): I.220.18.

leve (1): III.29.34.

lifte (1): II.58.31.

loke (1): M.321.35.

lyve (3): III.5.20; 231.16;—M.150.31.

make (2): II.380.9;—M.152.12 (or Coörd.?).

naile (1): M.104.30.

parte (1): I.321.23.

passe (1): I.397.11.

preche (1): III.513.18.

purpose (1): III.97.25.

putte (1): M.14.29.

- reise* (1): II.100.3.
repreve (1): M.293.2.
reste (1): III.160.32.
see (10): I.24.35; 84.2; 374.6; -II.50.15; 51.23; 66.28; 98.37; 149.29; 181.3; 205.16.
seie (4): III.482.28; 484.13; -M.160.13; 374.11.
shewe (1): II.124.24.
shrive (1): M.336.12.
slepe (4): I.250.13; -III.160.32; -M.133.25^a; 438.13^b.
spitte (2): II.193.12, 33.
stie (1): II.63.15.
suffre (1): III.265.14.
swere (1): M.8.2.
synne (1): III.5.17.
take (1): M.225.17.
teche (3): II.102.6; 110.30; -M.169.29.
truste (2): III.29.33; -M.160.7.
uploke (1): III.10.11.
wage (1): M.133.25^b.
wandre (1): II.134.5.
wake (1): M.438.13^a.
walke (1): II.143.24.
wende (3): I.56.22; 307.12; -II.166.10.
wipdrawe (1): M.72.27^b.

(b) The preterite participle of the following verbs seems to be used appositively to denote time:—

- caste* (1): II.204.10.
clense (1): III.7.7.
dampne (1): M.17.14 (or Cause?).
entre (1): I.119.6.
gadere (1): II.397.32.
make (1): I.27.21 (or Pred. Nom.).
seie (1): II.234.4.
turne (2): III.5.31, 32.
wounde (1): III.10.13.

(2) The Appositive Participle Denoting Cause

(a) The present participle of the following verbs seems to be used appositively to denote cause:—

- bowe* (1): III.7.8.
caste (1): I.154.19.
clense (1): III.5.30.
delyvere (1): III.5.31.
deme (1): III.223.11.

denye (1): I.386.3.
faile (1): I.149.3.
flee (1): III.35.16.
gesse (1): II.139.36.
graunte (1): I.79.15.
have (1): III.39.1.
holde (1): M.86.28 (or Time?).
hope (1): III.13.29.
knowe (4): I.110.34; 119.37;—III.11.2; 101.30.
love (3): III.38.1; 39.1; 136.35.
lyve (1): M.86.25.
oppresse (1): III.30.33.
preye (1): III.223.5.
repe (1): I.259.16.
reverse (1): II.386.4.
see (5): I.46.21, 34; 374.13;—II.44.29; 90.18.
springe (1): M.316.36.
suppose (1): I.273.36; 352.28;—M.363.6.
take (2): I.259.16;—III.375.35.
þenke (1): I.63.27.
undirstonde (1): III.129.20.
wante (1): III.29.33.
wille (1): I.182.18.
wite (7): I.80.25;—II.117.34; 118.4; 128.10;—III.250.2;—M.232.11; 232.14.

(b) The preterite participles have been quoted in full on page 29.

(3) The Appositive Participle Denoting Means

(a) The present participle of the following verbs seems to be used appositively to denote means:—

adde (1): I.73.35.
axe (2): I.72.18; 83.35.
do (4): I.23.13; 275.19;—II.31.20; 198.16.
ete (1): I.361.1.
zelde (1): III.6.19.
here (1): I.83.35.
kepe (1): I.45.30.
love (1): 108.21.
lyve (2): I.269.12;—II.69.23.
magnifie (1): M.26.33.
preie (1): I.269.12.
reverse (1): I.309.22.
saye (1): M.299.24.
sleye (1): I.322.33.

sue (2): I.108.21; -II.256.38.

suffre (2): I.23.13; 275.19.

telle (1): M.179.14.

turne (1): I.409.13.

wipdrawe (1): I.73.36.

(b) I have found no clear example of the preterite participle used appositively to denote means.

(4) The Appositive Participle Denoting Manner

(a) The present participle of the following verbs seems to me to be used appositively to denote manner:—

alarge (1): I.101.8 (?).

bere (1): II.127.14.

biginne (1): II.87.1.

conforte (1): III.10.8.

creese (1): I.358.3.

desire (1): II.360.15.

dispise (2): III.36.35 (?); 48.12 (?).

do (2): III.206.13^{a, b}.

faste (1): I.76.26 (?).

go (1): III.368.21 (?).

graunte (1) M.154.12 (?).

hele (1): II.166.11 (?).

kepe (1): III.206.12.

kunne (1): III.220.27.

lifte (1): III.487.3 (?).

lye (to tell a falsehood) (1): I.412.26.

lyve (1): II.353.33.

make (1): III.423.33.

mourne (1): II.179.31 (?).

multiplie (1): III.36.35 (?).

muse (1): I.134.28 (?).

preche (5): I.306.25; -II.17.36; 166.10; -III.296.26; 380.27 (all doubtful).

queme (1): III.11.15 (?).

reule (1): III.206.13.

see (1): II.93.17 (?).

seke (1): III.480.8.

singe (2): III.32.5, 7.

sorowe (1): I.84.5 (?).

stryve (1): III.299.26 (?).

suffre (1): III.57.18 (?).

teche (1): III.380.27 (?).

þanke (1): III.48.13 (?).

use (1): III.10.7.

walke (1): II.44.31 (?).
wepe (2): II.139.25 (?); 371.18.
wille (1): III.488.14.
worche (1): III.7.1 (?).
woundre (2): I.134.29 (?); -II.146.5 (?).

(b) The preterite participles which seem to me to denote manner (or which may be considered as Predicative) have been quoted in full on page 30 of this essay.

(5) The Appositive Participle Denoting Purpose

(a) The present participle of the following verbs seems to be used appositively to denote purpose:—

chastise (1): III.46.12.
zelde (1): III.5.3.
lede (1): III.35.18.
make (1): III.16.17.
nurishe (1): III.36.25.
preche (2): II.11.17 (?); 23.10.
ransake (1): III.34.26.
regne (1): III.28.36.
save (2): III.7.27; 247.19.
scatere (1): I.147.24.
shewe (1): I.301.6.
stire (1): III.13.31.
sue (1): I.43.31.
teche (5): I.15.26; 41.30; 43.30; 72.16; -II.23.10.
tempte (1): II.86.26.
upbere (1): III.35.17.
wete (1): I.2.12.
worschiþe (1): III.197.15.
wounde (1): III.27.24.

(b) I have found no preterite participles used appositively to denote purpose.

(6) The Appositive Participle Denoting Concession

The examples of the participles which seem to be used appositively to denote concession have been given in full on page 30 of this essay.

(7) The Appositive Participle Denoting Condition

(a) The present participle of the following verbs seems to me to be used appositively to denote condition:—

folowe (1): III.23.36.
have (1): M.410.19.

leve (1): M.312.29.
resseyve (1): III.27.9.
save (1): I.172.21.
stonde (1): II.216.7.
sue (1): III.385.24.
teche (1): M.51.3.
waste (1): III.474.10.

(b) All the examples of the preterite participle which seem to be used appositively to denote condition are given on page 31 of this essay.

3. The Coördinate Use

I have found only present participles used appositively in the relationship of independent clauses.

(1) The Circumstantial Use

The present participle of the following verbs seems to me to be used appositively to denote an accompanying circumstance:—

afferme (1): I.80.20.
amende (2): III.41.2; 419.29.
answere (3): II.169.5; 177.6; 178.17.
axe (1): M.46.28.
begge (1): M.51.2.
bere (1): I.84.16.
biginne (2): I.100.32 (or Manner?); 391.23.
bihete (1): M.40.38.
blaspheme (1): III.464.23.
blesse (1): II.159.11.
boste (1): I.166.26.
bowe (2): II.86.30, 34.
breke (1): M.394.11.
challenge (1): III.518.19.
clippe (1): II.26.29.
come (2): II.76.4 (or Temp.?); -III.46.32.
commande (1): M.44.11.
conferme (2): III.304.36; -M.370.17.
constreyne (1): III.120.10.
crye (1): II.204.21.
dele (1): III.495.8.
delyvere (1): III.5.26.
denye (1): III.46.4.
departe (1): III.73.36.
desire (2): III.51.11; 429.35.
dispende (1): III.45.20.

- distrie* (1): III.445.4.
do (4): I.17.31 (or Temp.);-II.250.33;-III.50.9;-M.147.29.
drede (2): II.178.20;-III.5.32.
dwelle (1): M.46.34.
encrese (1): III.492.10.
endite (1): III.13.23.
falle (1): II.94.30 (or Manner?).
feede (1): M.306.26.
flatere (1): III.495.30.
folde (1): II.125.1.
forgive (1): M.232.14.
forsake (1): I.29.12.
give (1): III.495.3.
go (4): II.27.21 (or Temp.); 336.36;-III.475.5; 495.1.
have (5): I.273.14;-II.284.24;-III.22.25; 473.14;-M.303.22^a.
helpe (3): II.165.5; 248.37;-III.492.10.
herie (3): I.107.18;-II.159.11;-III.32.35.
holde (3): II.204.24;-III.101.32;-M.172.16.
kepe (5): III.33.7; 35.36; 36.34; 219.29;-M.442.33.
knowe (2): III.5.25; 50.25.
lese (1): III.33.25.
lette (2): M.222.29; 224.26.
leve (4): I.377.24;-II.221.33;-M.277.1; 304.1.
loke (4): I.29.33; 32.4; 402.29;-II.209.5.
love (1): III.11.15.
lyve (1): M.40.4.
make (7): I.375.16;-III.6.27; 193.22; 301.4, 6; 457.10;-M.177.10;
 308.29.
marke (1): I.129.24.
medle (1): III.73.35.
mene (1): M.387.30.
meynteyne (1): III.485.10.
mourne (1): II.143.20.
move (1): III.445.29.
passe (3): III.205.34; 419.29; 420.38.
preie (1): II.186.11.
preise (2): III.517.12;-M.223.23^a.
pricke (1): M.24.16.
propose (1): I.80.27.
putte (6): II.26.30; 128.12;-III.47.4; 192.23; 194.3;-M.27.5.
quickene (1): III.46.15.
reckene (1): I.391.21.
renne (1): II.69.34.
rere (1): II.87.2.
resseyve (3): III.382.21 (or Means?); 457.5; 495.2.
reve (1): III.16.5.

- reyse* (2): II.135.9; -III.26.29.
rise (2): II.143.15; 168.4.
scatere (1): III.40.18.
see (1): III.45.18.
seie (11): I.102.24; 406.19; -II.168.5; -III.5.33; 17.16; 48.14; 274.17; 445.4; 465.31; -M.38.32; 381.21.
seke (1): I.376.5 (or Pred. Nom?).
sende (1): M.24.15.
sette (1): III.49.13.
serve (2): III.472.5; -M.227.12.
shryve (1): II.5.10.
singe (1): M.206.7.
sitte (2): I.166.76; -II.30.8.
speke (2): II.364.14; -M.41.35.
spitte (2): I.29.32; -II.14.30.
stire (1): II.351.33.
stonde (4): II.168.22; -III.115.20; 465.26; -M.390.15.
straye (1): M.380.33.
stretche (1): I.376.7.
sue (1): III.194.3.
suffre (2): II.250.33; -III.193.19.
suppose (1): III.437.5.
take (9): I.17.30; -II.134.10; 193.11; -III.457.5; 495.2; 518.33; -M.161.5^a; 230.26; 303.20.
teche (2): III.287.34; 492.35.
panke (1): III.18.17.
penke (1): III.205.35 (or Manner?).
to-terre (1): II.204.22.
turne (2): II.69.29; -III.520.19.
undertake (1): M.13.4.
use (1): III.150.17.
wasshe (1): III.214.7.
wepe (1): II.143.21.
witte (1): M.227.20.
wipdrawe (1): III.469.2.
worche (1): I.30.33.
wrappe (1): III.469.2.

(2) The Iterative Use

The present participle of the following verbs seems to be used appositively to denote repeated action:—

- answere* (10): I.12.32; 243.19; 349.3; 355.22; 396.11; -II.27.22; 47.14; 79.8; 153.20; 179.24.
seye (8): I.379.1; 396.5; -M.17.5; 233.12; 382.5; 383.13, 27; 387.8.
speke (2): I.377.23; -III.518.8.

A HEROIC POEM ON THE DEATH OF SIR THOMAS MORE—BY D. ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM¹

BY D. T. STARNES

I

Although the title-page definitely ascribes to Erasmus the *Carmen Heroicum* on the death of More, this poem never has been included in a list of Erasmus's authentic writings. It is mentioned, indeed, by only two of his biographers; and they differ in opinion as to its authenticity. Jortin (*Life of Erasmus* (1758), II, 289) maintained that Erasmus had not the strength to write the poem just before his death, nor hatred enough to insult Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn as violently as they are insulted in this poem.

¹The title-page of the small volume from which the poem below is reprinted reads as follows: *Incomparabilis doctrine, trium item Lingarū peritissimi viri D. Erasmi Rotherodami in sanctissimorum martirū Rofensis Episcopi, ac T. Mori, jam pridem in Anglia pro christiane veritate constanter defensa innocenter passorum Heroicū carmen tam elegans et lectu dignissimū. (Sequitur nonullarum dictionum et historiarum presentis carminis brevissima elucidatio H. Geb[vilero] autore. Vita J. Phisceri, Rofensis Episcopi, ex D. Erasmi scriptis elicita. Passio Episcopi Roffensis et T. Mori.) Per V. Kobian: Haganau, 1536. 4 (British Museum 851.1. 10. [2]). Another copy—G. 1577). Another edition—Excusum denuo elimatius [edited by H. Gebweiler] Haganau (1536). British Museum (II.408. aaa.30).*

The title placed by the editor at the head of this poem reads thus: *D. Erasmi Roterodai Carmen Heroicum In Mortem Thomae Mori*. *Roterodai* is evidently a misprint for *Roterodami*.

Of the three copies of the poem in the British Museum, two are of the same edition; and the third is of another edition in the same year. All were printed at Haganau in the year 1536. The texts are identical. Jerome Gebweiler is the editor. The text reprinted below is that bearing the library number 851.1.10 (2). After stating my reasons for belief that the poem is a genuine composition of Erasmus, I reprint the text. A few of the comments on the text are translated from Gebweiler's *elucidatio*. In each instance Gebweiler's comment is followed by the letter "G."

Professor Preserved Smith (*Erasmus* (1923), p. 418) saw no reason to doubt its authenticity.

The date of publication, as indicated in Gebweiler's dedication to John Count Palatine of the Rhine, Duke of Bavaria, etc., is September, 1536. Although Gebweiler states definitely that the poem was composed by Erasmus, he is not certain of the date of composition. The rumor is, he writes to the Count, that the poem was done a few months before Erasmus's death.² As Erasmus died on July 12, 1536, we may take this date as the *terminus ad quem* for the composition. But the text of the poem seems to support Gebweiler's statement that it was composed a few months before Erasmus's decease. Line 112, for example, predicts that the king *will* inflict punishment upon his "hateful harlot" (Anne Boleyn). Anne Boleyn was executed on May 19, 1536. If the poem were composed later than this date, the author either had not heard of the execution, or he based his prophecy on an event which had already occurred. Either explanation is possible. But it is much more probable, since More's death took place in July, 1535, that this poem was composed before Anne Boleyn's execution—perhaps in the latter months of 1535 or early in 1536. There is not a line in the poem to indicate that the author knew of Anne Boleyn's execution. On the contrary, the whole context supports a date of composition prior to her death. Moreover, it seems entirely probable that the poem was begun immediately after Erasmus had confirmed the news of More's execution. At least a part

²After a page of the dedication laudatory of the Count, Gebweiler continues:

. . . ego illustris magnificentiae tuae minimorum clientulorum rationario inscribi petens, ne vacuis manibus tanti Principis aedes adirem, praesens Heroicum Carmen doctissimo Erasmo Rotherodamo paucis mensibus (ut rumor est) priusque mortem obiisset, in sanctorum martyrum Roffensis Episcopi et Thomae Mori passionem doctissime Lusum celsitudini tuae mittendum duxi, quod eo gratius illustri magnificentiae tuae futurum arbitror, quo integer rimos illos viros cum autorem carminis, tum eos qui carminis materies sunt, viventes tibi non dubito fuisse carissimos . . . Datum Haganoae Kalendis Septembribus. Anno . . . M D XXXVI.

of this elegy seems to have been written at white heat. Composition at this period would be consistent with Gebweiler's statement.

Although Erasmus was in distress during the last few months of his life, he was able to write many long letters—letters which show that his mind was still active and vigorous.³ It does not follow, then, as Jortin asserts, that Erasmus could not have written this poem. On the contrary, although the poem shows less restraint than is common in Erasmus's earlier writings, it is quite in harmony with the mood and tone exhibited in his letters of this period.

According to my interpretation of his Dedication, Gebweiler does not question Erasmus's authorship. His only doubt is in respect to the time of composition. On this point, he frankly admits that his authority is a report—a report, however, which is entirely plausible. Until reason can be shown for his falsifying the facts, it seems to me we should accept in good faith Gebweiler's statements in the Dedication. It is to be remembered, too, that he addresses the Count as a friend of Erasmus. And as a friend, the Count could probably not have been imposed upon by a poem falsely ascribed to Erasmus; nor does it seem probable that, to his patron, Gebweiler would have dared to dedicate as genuine a poem not written by Erasmus.

We are not, however, limited solely to Gebweiler's testimony for external evidence of authorship. Bound in the pamphlet which contains the poem on More's death is a prose tract by John Cochlaeus,⁴ a friend of Erasmus and of

³Cf. *Epistolarum Roterodami Libri XXXI* . . . Londini, 1642:

- (1) D. Erasmus Roterodamus Bartolomeo. Basiliae. 24 Aug., 1535 (columns 1542–1544).
- (2) D. Erasmus Roterodamus Petro Tomicio Episcopo Cracoviensi. Basiliae. 31 Aug., 1535 (columns 1538–1542).
- (3) D. Erasmus Roterodamus Gilberto Cognato Canonico . . . Basiliae. 12 Feb., 1536 (columns 1564–1565).
- (4) D. Erasmus Roterodamus (to the same). 12 Mar., 1536.

⁴*Defensio Clarissimorum Virorum J. Fyscheri Episcopi Roffensio et Thomae Mori Baronis* . . . adv. R. Sampsonum.

More. In the same pamphlet also are Latin excerpts from the letters of Erasmus. One of these excerpts⁵ is of special interest. It appears not only among the tracts, including the *Defensio*, etc., by Cochlaeus, bound with the poem (1536) on More's death, but it is reprinted again in the *Acta et Scripta Martini Lutheri* (1549) of Cochlaeus. The excerpt is evidence, I think, of Cochlaeus's interest, probably of collaboration, in the printing of the earlier documents and of his acquiescence in the ascription of the elegy to Erasmus. His use of the same passage thirteen years later shows that Cochlaeus had not changed his mind.

This excerpt—from a long letter by Erasmus—reveals, besides Erasmus's knowledge of the facts concerning the death of More and Fisher, an attitude of mind consonant with that of the author of the poem. In the same work (*Acta et Scripta*, etc., p. 289), Cochlaeus writes that, although Erasmus had often been liberally honored by the

⁵Sexto Nonas Julii obtruncatus est in Britannia Thomas Morus, non minorem constantiam in iudicio et suplicio prae se ferensque iniquissimo Atheniensium Senatus consulto condemnatus Socrates. Paucis diebus ante illum interfecto Episcopo Roffensi. In quem Regis furor non alia causa vehementius exarsitque quod is in Cardinalium ordinem a Pontifice esset cooptatus. Sed audi, quod vincit omnem veritatem. Caput Roffensis inditum stipiti, multis diebus omnium oculis fuit expositum. Quod non modo non contabuisse, verum etiam multo venerabilius esse factum ferebatur. Ubi is rumor percrebuit mox amotum est loco. Et nequid in Mori capiti existeret quo populus religione turbaretur, audi iam facinus immanissimum. Renovata est Thyestea Fabula, et caput eius non nisi longa coctura maceratum quo celerius diffunderet, hastili est impostum. Causae feruntur tres. Prima, Noluit iurare secundum formulam Lutheri, se credere, nullum esse ius Pontificis in rebus Ecclesiasticis, sed Regem Angliae esse caput Ecclesiae Anglicanae. Secunda, Noluit affirmare ultimum Matrimonium rite factum, aut priorem uxorem recte repudiatam. Tertia, Afferebantur litterae ad Roffensem scriptae, ut vel Dux esset vel comes, fortiter pro veritate occumbendi, se enim paratum esse ipsi vitam impendere. Quod ille fecisse et recte fecisse se asseverabat. Itaque Iudicum sententia vir optimus exitum vitae, quem dixi, fortitus est. Anno MD XXXV.

(From pamphlet containing the poem on the death of More (1536). Cf. also, J. Cochlaeus, *Acta et Scripta Lutheri* (ed. J. Dobneck, 1549), pp. 284-5.)

king, he had publicly testified to his grief at the death of More and Fisher. He then quotes from another letter, in which Erasmus complains of the loss of friends and pays special tribute to More.⁶ The conclusion which follows from the external evidence is that both Gebweiler and Cochlaeus believed Erasmus to be the author of this poem. Being friends of Erasmus, they were in a position to know the facts. Until reason can be shown why they should misrepresent the facts, their testimony must be regarded as significant.

Internal evidence also supports the theory of Erasmus's authorship. The content of the poem, for example, is in accord with views elsewhere expressed by Erasmus. It is noteworthy that the author, at the beginning of his poem refers to More as a poet, to bewail whose loss he invokes the Muses. Near the conclusion, he refers again to More as a poet. Although readers of such verses as More has left to us may not grow enthusiastic about More as a poet—may not, indeed, think of him as a poet at all—Erasmus, early and late, expressed in his letters his admiration of More's aptitude for poetry; and it is not unreasonable to believe that he always thought of Thomas More as essentially a poet.

In a letter to John Froben, written from Louvain, August 25, 1517, Erasmus refers to More's genius in general, and continues:

What indeed might not have been expected from that admirable felicity of nature, if this genius had had Italian instruction, if it had

⁶. . . Erasmus Roterodamus, quanquam a Rege illo saepe liberaliter honoratus fuerat: de morte tamen Roffensis & Mori in suo Ecclesiaste (quem de modo concionandi scripsit) libere suum publice testatus est dolorem. Deflentur (inquit) merces naufragio amissae. At quae merx tam preciosa, ut cum syncero amico conferri quot? Quid igitur hac tempestate crudelius, quae me tot spectatissimus amicis spoliavit? Pridem Guilhelmo Varramo, Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi: nuper Guilhelmo Montioio, Episcopo Roffensis, & Thoma Moro, qui fuit eius regni supremus Iudex. Cui pectus erat omni nive candidius: Ingenium, quale omnia nec habuit unquam, nec habitura est, alioqui nequiquam infoelicum ingeniorum parens. Haec Erasmus. . . . (J. Cochlaeus, *loc cit.*, p. 289.)

been entirely consecrated to the Muses, and had been allowed to ripen at its season: . . .

To Paulus Bombasius, July 26, 1518, Erasmus writes:

Thomas More is of the Privy Council, whose incomparable charm is due *not only to the Muses and Graces*, but also to his wit, of whose genius you have been able in some degree to taste the flavour from his writings (quoted by Norman Moore, "The Friends of Erasmus whose names appear in the letters Patent Founding our College" [Pembroke], 23 Sept., 1517).

Writing to Ulrich Von Hutten from Antwerp on July 22, 1519, Erasmus, having first paid tribute to the character and ability of More in general, remarks:

Primã aetatem carmine potissimum exercuit mox diu luctatus est ut prosam orationem redderet molliorẽ, per omne scripti genus stilũ exercens: qui cuiusmodi sit; quod attinet cõmemorare? tibi praesertim, qui libros eius semper habeas in manibus. (Sir Thomas More's Works (Basil, 1563), p. 507.)

What is worthy of note in these quotations is that Erasmus repeatedly expressed admiration for More's poetic talent, undeveloped though it was. For the same reason More is praised in the beginning of the poem (ll.5-6) on his death. This expressed admiration, common to the poem and the letters, of More's aptitude for poetry is significant in this discussion.

A warm friendship between Erasmus and More continued until the latter's death. Of Erasmus's poignant grief for the tragic death of his friend, there are many testimonials. To Petrus Tomicius, in August, 1535, Erasmus wrote:

In More I seem to have died, so much did we have one soul, as Pythagoras said. But such are the surges of human fate (Smith, *Erasmus*, p. 416; cf. also *Epistolarum D. Erasmi Roterodami, Libri XXXI* . . . 1542, col. 1538).

In the same year Erasmus wrote in the Preface of his *Ecclesiastes*:

Only the other day I lost William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, and now recently Lord Mountjoy; now the Bishop of Rochester is gone, and Thomas More, the supreme judge of that kingdom, whose

heart was whiter than any snow and the like of whose genius England never had and never will have again. (J. J. Mangan, *Life, Character, and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam* (1927), 2 vols., V. 11, p. 371. Cf. also, Cochlaeus, *Acta et Scripta Martini Lutheri* (1549, p. 289)).⁷

These letters, in spirit and content, are quite in harmony with the subject matter of the poem under discussion. Likewise, the concern expressed in the poem (ll. 41 ff.) for Queen Catharine is not inconsistent with Erasmus's attitude revealed in other writings. As early as 1518 Erasmus wrote to Paulus Bombasius:

. . . The Queen, a wonder of her sex, is well educated, and is no less deserving of respect for piety than for learning (Norman Moore, *loc. cit.*).

In 1526 Erasmus wrote, at the Queen's request, the *Institution of Christian Matrimony*. The dedicatory letter "extols the queen as the example of the most perfect wife of this generation, as her mother, Isabella of Castile, had been before her." . . . Although the question of Henry's divorce from Catharine had not yet become prominent, Erasmus discussed the evils of divorce in general, and expressed as his opinion that union with a brother's widow was not sufficient cause for nullifying a marriage. When the question of the great divorce did become paramount, Erasmus was generally careful not to commit himself. It is noteworthy, however, that in 1534 he applauded John Cochlaeus for writing against the divorce (Smith, *Erasmus*, 283; cf. also M. Spahn, *J. Cochlaeus* (1898), p. 250. On Erasmus's attitude in general, see Smith, *ibid.*, 278-285).

That Erasmus was in the good graces of the Pope on this question, as on every other, may be inferred from the following letter, sent by the Pope to Erasmus as late as August 1, 1535:

Beloved son: health and the Apostolic benediction: Being mindful of your probity and integrity and of your eminence in the various

⁷Cf. Poem, ll. 77 ff.: "Thou wert the ornament of the kingdom as well as the most cherished counselor of the king; and no other judge rendered decisions more justly."

kinds of learning, as well as of your merits toward the Apostolic See in fighting with all your ability against the deserters of the Faith, we have gratefully conferred on you the provostship of the canons of Deventer in the diocese of Utrecht . . . so that you may already experience some reward for your virtue . . . being prepared to favour your virtue and erudition as also your judgment and intentions at every opportunity. Given at Rome at St. Mark's . . . Aug. 1, 1535 (Mangan, *loc. cit.*, 11, 363).

In structure, language, idiom, and meter the *Carmen Heroicum* is classical. It exhibits, too, a familiar and accurate use of classical mythology and literature—all characteristic of a poem that Erasmus might be expected to write. In the Catalogue of *Lucubrationes* (Allen, I, 3; cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 467) Erasmus says he had written every sort of poem,^s and had left some unpublished. Some of these are printed by Professor Smith (*op. cit.*, App. III, 453-7). They reveal in general the classical qualities noted above. One of these poems, *Carmen Extemporale* (Smith, *ibid.*, 453-454), is of special interest in this discussion. Although this poem was addressed to Skelton some years before the poem was composed on the death of More, the two poems contain words, phrases, and classical references and allusions in common. Compare:

Carmen Extemporale
Aeterna vates Skelton dignissime
 lauro
 Castaldumque decus.

Carmen Heroicum, etc.
Aeternum venerande senex
 . . . laurus aspires odores,
Sacrum laurigeri vatis complexa
 sepulchrum
Tu regni decus.

^sCf. Sixtin, letter to Erasmus (1499), in which Sixtin praises the verses of Erasmus as of "unusual metre and uncommon charm." . . . "For they breathe a certain Attic charm and show forth the marvelous sweetness of your genius" (Mangan, I, 101). In sending a list of his works to John Botzheim in 1523, Erasmus writes that there was no kind of verse at which he had not tried his hand. He mentioned a heroic poem in the style of mixed tetrameter, dedicated to Fausto Andrelini, etc. (Mangan, I, 121 ff.).

Carmen Extemporale

Nos neque Pieridum celebravimus
 antra sororum
 Fonte nec Aonio

Si tibi Calliope . . .
 . . . tu carmine vincis olorem.
 Ultro porrecta cithara
 Rhodopeius Orpheus.
 . . . et duras ducere quercus
 Tu potes.

Primus in hanc Latio deduxit
 ab orbe

Vive valeque diu

Carmen Heroicum, etc.

Vos mihi pierides . . .
 Dictate.
 Vertice ab aonio molli deducere
 versu . . .
 Exequias celebrate . . .

Tuque adeo mihi Calliope.
 . . . olores . . . dulce canentes.
 Insignem cithara, qui vos . . .
 deducere versu.

Vertice ab aonio molli
 deducere versu.

Salveque valeque.

To summarize, the date of composition of the *Carmen Heroicum*, as nearly as it can be determined, and the date of publication indicated on the title-page are consistent with the events of Erasmus's life subsequent to the death of More. Contemporary ascription of authorship to Erasmus by his friends, Gebweiler and Cochlaeus, is to be regarded as sound evidence. Correspondence in thought and expression of the *Carmen* to the subject matter of letters and poems known to have been written by Erasmus further supports the theory of Erasmus's authorship. The stylistic qualities of this poem, including classical allusion and classical structure and diction, point to the same conclusion. In the light of these facts, there seems to be no sound reason why we should not accept as authentic the ascription of the title-page, which definitely assigns the *Carmen Heroicum* to Erasmus of Rotterdam.

II

D. ERASMI ROTERODA[M]I CARMEN HEROICUM
 IN MORTEM THOMAE MORI

Extinctum flemus crudeli funere Morum,
 Et Regem immanem, veneremque cruore madentem,

1.2. *Immanem, veneremque*: The love of the English king for a harlot, on account of whom excellent men have been blamelessly slaughtered (G.).

- Fortunaeque vices, & lesae pellicis iram.
 Vos mihi pierides, feralia carmina musae
 5 Dictate, & mecum vatem lugete peremptum,
 Insignem cithara, qui vos persaepe solebat
 Vertice ab aonio molli deducere versu.
 Tuque adeo mihi Calliope, quae regia facta
 Et casus miserorum hominum cantare perita es,
 10 Nec cedes exhorrescis memorare cruentas,
 Dextera ades, tu vera Erato, tu blanda Thalia
 Truncatum interea tumulto componite corpus
 Exequias celebrate, & spargite floribus urnam,
 Et tumulto castos laurus aspiret odores,
 15 Sacrum laurigeri vatis complexa sepulchrum.
 Te quoque deflere divum venerande sacerdos
 Roffensis, praesul populi, qui dura subisti
 Fata prior, sancta pro religione tuenda.
 Sed vatem canimus, vates tua maxima facta
 20 Vulgabunt alii & praeclara volumina condent,
 Attollentque tuum super aurea sydera nomen.
 Tempus erat mundi cum iam adventante ruina
 Occideret senio iustum, & labefacta deorum
 Religio caderet, tot sustentata per annos,
 25 Mortalesque fidem tota demente fugassent.
 At dolus & fastus, cumque impietate libido
 Ambitioque & livor edax, fulvi & sitis auri
 Grassantes late, qua sol sublimis utrumque
 Aspicit Oceanum geminas quoque respicit arctos
 30 Miscebantque prophana sacris & sacra prophanis
 Tum furiae ex imis caput eduxere tenebris
 Anguineas capitum quatientes undique cristas
 Armatae facibus phlegetontaeoque veneno
 Nec mora ceruleos subito petiere britannos
 35 Fatorum gnarae tempus namque affore norant
 Quo Rex Henricus reiecto coniugis usu
 In vetitos rueret thalamos famosus adulter
 Atque alias taedas alios celebrans himenēos
 Mentis inops, regni indotatam in parte locarat

1.5. *Vatem*: The poet, More.

1.17. *Roffensis praesul*: His name was John Fisher.

1.22 *Tempus erat*: The poet begins his narrative, not inaptly introducing the statement that piety, justice, and the rest of the virtues had been driven from the life of mankind, and that, on account of the enormous sins of men, it was not without divine permission that so many heresies and other deplorable evils, at the instigation of evil spirits, had everywhere sprung up in the Christian world (G.).

- 40 Vilem animam & nullo maiorum stemmate claram.
 At Regina prior thalamis eiecta mariti
 Coniugii laude & titulis regalibus orba
 Ingratum in lachrimis & luctu duceret aevum
 Illa quidem magni de sanguine Ferdinandi
- 45 Primus qui mauros regnis exegit avitis
 Quo nunquam hesperia regnasset maior in ora
 Ni sua progenies maiori nomine Caesar
 Mundi sceptrum tenens titulos superasset avorum
 At postquam dirae subierunt regia tecta
- 50 Eumenides, tremuit cum terra conscius aether
 Horruit Oceanus pater & circumflua Tethiis
 Imis delituere vadis, Rex ipse maritus
 Iam novus inprimis & adhuc complexibus herens
 Extimuit facti poenas iramque deorum
- 55 Ille autem ut videre novos celebrare hymenaeos
 Gaudebant pariter dirae pariterque dolebant
 Crimine gaudebant sed non autoribus ipsis
 Patratum doluere nephas, nimiumque potentem
 Et venerem & volucris tela indignantur amoris.
- 60 Ergo aliud meditantur opus, dirumque frementes
 Pellicis insinuant atrum in praecordia virus.
 Et stolido regi eripiunt mentemque animumque.
 Ille scelus firmare suum maioribus ausis
 Enitens, sceleri scelus adiicit, & contemptis
- 65 Pontificis summi monitis, quibus ille iubebat
 Eiiceret Moecham, Thalamique in iura vocaret
 Legitimam uxorem, solitoque ornaret honore.
 Ipse sibi ius pontificis, nomenque sacratum
 Quam late sua regna patent usurpat, & omnem
- 70 Sacrilegus veterem conuellit religionem,
 Et gravius peccat, ut non peccasse putetur.
 Egregia interea pellex, quae gaudia sentit?
 In quorum iugulos miserum non armat amantem?
 Praecipue si quos probitas suspecta & honesti

1.46. *Hesperia . . . ora*: Spain, which received its name from Hesperus, the evening star in the west (G.).

1.47. *Ni sua progenies*: Charles the Fifth, Caesar, the grandson by the daughter, Joanna (G.). There follows a lengthy tribute by Gebweiler to Charles the Fifth.

1.68. *Ipse sibi ius Pontificis*: It is established that, in order more easily to mitigate with a certain coloring his intended marriage with a harlot, the king of England utterly rejected the decrees of the most holy council and usurped for himself, exclusively, the name of vicar of Christ (G.).

- 75 Prodit amor, More infoelix sic te tua virtus
Perdidit, heu aevi scelus atque infamia nostri.
Tu regni decus, & regi charissimus idem
Consultor fueras, nec iudex aequior alter
Iura dabat. Heu qua pensant mercede laborem
80 Fata tibi? poteras illaesam ducere vitam,
Sed minus esse probus, vitae quam dura relictæ
Conditio fuit insonti? si vera professus
Fatalem exciperet cana cervice securim.
Sin vitam falsa vellet ratione tueri,
85 Applaudens stupris infandæque ambitioni,
Pollueret moresque suos vitamque priorem.
Offensamque hominis mutaret numinis ira.
Ille autem iustique tenax, cultorque deorum
Sponte sua ferro caput obtulit, & procumbens
90 Purpureum fudit sacro de pectore rivum.
Fortunate senex animi tibi regia coeli
Tota patet, tibi rex superum violacea sarta
Porrigit ipsi manu magno applaudente senatu
Coeliculum, & volucres recinunt poeana ministri
95 Omnes intonsi, niveis in vestibus omnes.
Quales ad vitreum meandri flumen olores
Mille volant, plauduntque alis & dulce canentes
Coeruleum nitidis praetexunt aera pennis,
Interea truncum iacet, & sine nomine corpus,
100 Spectaculum populo durum, at polluta cruore
Canicies, nequid sceleris restaret in ausum,
Praefixa infandi spectanda exponitur hasta.
Opprobrium genti aeternum, ne scilicet unquam
Ignoret tantos aetas ventura furores.
105 Hoc ne tuae veneri Rex o incestæ trophaeum
Erigis, & mollem placare sanguine divam
Posse putas? iras in te convertet acerbas
Ipsa venus, vindexque tuos subvertet amores,
Atque aliis iterum atque aliis tua pectora flammis
110 Uret, & infamis venient tibi taedia vitae
Tunc memor indigne caedis tua noxia facta
Flebis, & invisæ sumes de pellice poenas.
Pellaeus iuvenis furiis agitatus, & ira

1.100. *Spectaculum* (sic) = *Spectaculum*.

1.112. *Invisæ sumes de pellice poenas*: This penalty in this present year (if report is to be credited) has already been exacted, not without the righteous judgment of God; and the harlot mentioned, together with her adulterers or lovers, has been executed (G.).

1.113. *Pellaeus iuvenis*: Alexander the Great (G.).

- 115 Incandens multoque animi inflamatus Iacho,
 Dilectum ante alios inter convivia Clitum
 Transfodit ferro, & resparsit sanguine mensas.
 At postquam furor ille animi discussus & omnis
 Consumptus vini vapor est, mentemque recepit,
 120 Ipse manus inferre sibi sociumque per umbras
 Velle sequi, & miseros incassum fundere questus.
 Tresque adeo moestus soles totidem quoque noctes
 Exegit lachrimans, luctu confusus acerbo
 Nequicquam neque enim luctu revocantur acerbo
 Pallentes animae, quas per vada lurida vexit
 125 Portitor ille Charon, & avaro tradidit orco.
 Tu quoque dilectum frustra plorabis amicum
 Cum tibi discusso mens pura redibit amore.
 Interea horrifico rumpet tua somnia vultu
 Umbra viri, multoque caput foedata cruore.
 130 Quo te cumque feres dira occursabit imago.
 Suplicium saevis expectans horrida factis.
 Namque tuis donec regnis exutus & exul
 Aeternum implorabis opem rerum omnium egenus
 Morus inultus erit, nulla est violentia longa,
 135 Vindictaeque moram poena graviore rependunt
 Numina, iustitiam quorum haud effugerit ullus.
 At nos aeternum tua tristia funera More
 Insatiabiliter deflebimus o bone vates,
 Tu mortem sancta pro religione subisti
 140 Crudelem, tibi divinos pro talibus ausis
 Mortales debent cultus, tibi templa, tibi aras
 Aeternum venerande senex salveque valeque,
 Seu colis elisium, seu coeli lucida templa,
 Accipe & hunc nostrum non dura fronte laborem.

1.128. *Interea Horrifico*: The common opinion is that the murderers of people unjustly slain are tortured by the shades or ghosts of the slain; as Romulus by Remus, and Orestes by his mother, Clytemnestra (G.).

1.135. *Vindictaeque moram*: With a slow pace, indeed, as says Valerius Maximus, proceeds divine vengeance in vindicating itself; but it makes up for slowness by severity of punishment.

TWO NOTES ON SHAKESPEARIAN PARALLELS

BY ROBERT ADGER LAW

I

Relations between the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare and *Romeo and Juliet* present a teasing problem. That the play was written or revised while Shakespeare was composing his sonnets is indicated by the discovery of more parallels to the *Sonnets* in *Romeo* and in *Love's Labour's Lost* than in any other play.¹ Other internal evidence of simultaneous composition is the use of the standard sonnet form for the Prologues placed before Act I and Act II of the play, and for the dialogue between the lovers in their first meeting (Act I, scene v), as well as the sestette employed by Paris in the final scene as he strews flowers on Juliet's grave. To the same effect goes Mercutio's raillery of the hero: "Now is he for the numbers that Petrarch flowed in: Laura to his lady was but a kitchen-wench; marry, she had a better love to berhyme her" (Act II, sc. iv, ll.38-40). The original play is now believed to have been composed between 1593 and 1595; that is precisely the period when sonnet sequences were most in vogue among Elizabethan poets, and the period when Lee, Alden, and Adams, most recent biographers of Shakespeare, agree that most of the *Sonnets* took shape.

Now this means that Shakespeare is likely to have been studying Arthur Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet*, the immediate source of his play, at the very time he was making his sonnets. In two of his best known *Sonnets*, Nos. 18 and 33, we may find suggestions from Brooke. These two sonnets are much alike in thought, each based on the somewhat unusual comparison of a friend or a lover to a suddenly beclouded sky.

¹See Alden, *Variorum Edition of the Sonnets*, p. 447. See pp. 441-452 of the same volume for a summary of opinion as to their date of composition.

The octave of Sonnet 18 runs :

Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
 Thou art more lovely and more temperate:
 Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May,
 And summer's lease hath all too short a date;
 Sometime too hot the eye of heaven shines,
 And often is his gold complexion dimm'd;
 And every fair from fair sometimes declines,
 By chance or nature's changing course untrimm'd.

Compare the first twelve lines of Sonnet 33 :

Full many a glorious morning have I seen
 Flatter the mountain tops with sovereign eye,
 Kissing with golden face the meadows green,
 Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchemy;
 Anon permit the basest clouds to ride
 With heavenly rack on his celestial face,
 And from the forlorn world his visage hide
 Stealing unseen to west with this disgrace;
 Even so my sun one early morn did shine
 With all triumphant splendour on my brow;
But out, alack! he was but one hour mine;
 The region cloud hath mask'd him from me now.

The corresponding passage in Brooke's poem begins with the heavy fortune of the lovers after the announcement of Romeus's banishment, l. 1513 :

Whereto may I compare (O lovers) this your day?
 Like dayes the painefull marriners are wonted to assay;
 For beat with tempest great, when they at length
 espye
 Some little beame of Phoebus light that perceth
 through the skie,
 To cleare the shadowde earth, by clearness of his face,
 They hope that dreadles they shal runne the remnant
 of their race . . .
 But straight the boysterous windes, with greater
 fury blowe,
 And over boord the broken mast, the stormy blastes
 doe throwe,
 The heavens large are clad with cloudes as dark as hell.

Continuing the same thought, Romeus declares, l. 1565 :

But now (alacke) too soon my bliss is overblowne.

The most striking verbal resemblances are, of course, those between the two pairs of lines that I have italicized. But, aside from these two parallels, the underlying picture presented in Shakespeare seems to me to resemble closely that in Brooke, despite the fact that the later poet omits all mention of the mariners and the shipwreck. If this resemblance be fortuitous, the coincidence is unusual.

II

Apparently no one has called attention to a marked similarity of situation between the final scene of Act I in *Romeo and Juliet* and the corresponding final scene of Act I in *Henry the Eighth*.

In both plays a dance is in progress, given by Old Capulet in one case, by Wolsey in the other. To each assembly enter a company of masked men, uninvited but welcomed in each instance by the host, and later invited by him to partake of a banquet. In each play the masked hero is attracted by the beauty of an unknown lady.

Romeo declares that he will

touching hers, make blessed my rude hand.
Did my heart love till now? Forswear it, sight!
For I ne'er saw true beauty till this night. (I. v. 53-55.)

King Henry correspondingly exclaims:

The fairest hand I ever touch'd! O beauty,
Till now I never knew thee! (I. iv. 75-76.)

In both dramas the hero requests a kiss of the lady, who assents, in *Romeo* after a brief discussion of "mannerly devotion," in *Henry* after the King's asseveration that it would be "unmannerly" not to kiss her while taking her out to dance. Romeo inquires of the Nurse and learns that the lady is Capulet's daughter; Henry inquires of the Lord Chamberlain and learns that this unknown beauty is Viscount Rochford's daughter. Then begins in each case a new romance, ending in marriage and the forgetting of former loves.

The earlier play, of course, is *Romeo*, and there is nothing corresponding to this scene in the chronicle sources of

Henry the Eighth. One must not, however, accept these parallels as necessarily a proof of Shakespeare's authorship of both scenes. Fletcher's plays show numerous instances of similar borrowings from known plays of Shakespeare, and the presence of these parallels is easily consistent with the theory generally accepted today of Fletcher's authorship of the scene in *Henry the Eighth*.

ON SHAKESPEARE'S CHANGES OF HIS SOURCE MATERIAL IN *ROMEO AND JULIET*

BY ROBERT ADGER LAW

So closely has Shakespeare followed the narrative of Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet*¹ in composing his own tragedy of similar title as sometimes to create the impression that he took the material over without serious change except for its rendition in charming lyric and dramatic verse. Tabular compilations of the use of specific lines from Brooke show singular dependence on him rather than on any other narrator of the oft-told tale.² The borrowing is apparent in every scene and in almost every long speech of the play. Besides, in this drama Shakespeare, contrary to his usual practice, has followed his original almost explicitly in the order of events. Discussions of Shakespeare's modifications of the story have been put in general rather than in specific terms, stressing the dramatist's compression of time, his characterization, his attention to Paris and Mercutio, and his motivation of several incidents. It is my

¹Brooke's poem, first published in 1562 and reprinted in 1587, has been carefully edited by P. A. Daniel for the New Shakspeare Society, London, 1875; and by J. J. Munro, in *The Shakespeare Library*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1908. Other reprints are by Collier in *Shakespeare's Library*, II, 1-88 (1843); by Hazlitt in his revision of Collier, I, 57-204 (1875); by Halliwell in his edition of *Shakespeare's Works*, XIII, 34-94 (1864); and by Cassell in a paper edition, bound with the "Historie of Hamlet" (1890). It has also been translated, line for line, into German and printed with the original on opposite pages in *Quellen zu Shakespeare: Romeo und Julia*, Bonn, 1922, by Rudolf Fischer. Discussions of its relation to Shakespeare's play are in Furness's *Variorum Romeo and Juliet* (1871), pp. 397-408; in Daniel, *op. cit.*, introduction, pp. xii-xvii; in Munro, *op. cit.*, introduction, pp. xv-lx, and Appendix I, pp. 131-145; in W. Strunk's edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, Riverside Lit. Series, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1911, introduction, pp. xiv-xviii; and in the writer's edition of the play, *Arden Shakespeare*, D. C. Heath & Co., New York, 1913, pp. 193-206.

²See, for example, Daniel's notes, *op. cit.*, *passim*, and Munro's table, *op. cit.*, Appendix I.

purpose to analyze anew Shakespeare's modifications of the story, particularly in plot structure, with the hope of presenting a more definite correlation of the two versions, and perhaps shedding some light on Shakespeare's early craftsmanship.

I

Structural Functions of the Minor Characters

The functions served by the minor characters in Shakespeare's plot show his changes more clearly than does a study of either Romeo or Juliet. So far as I am able to perceive, the only important action by either one of the lovers not found in Brooke is Romeo's slaying of Paris in the final scene. With the minor figures it is generally different. This can be made clear by a somewhat monotonous listing of their several rôles in Shakespeare and in Brooke.³

Paris first appears in the play in a slight effort to reconcile Old Capulet with the Montagues, but immediately turns to pressing the suit for Juliet's hand that he has off-stage urged upon her father, and having gained Capulet's partial consent, is invited to an "old accustomed feast" to be given by Capulet that night⁴ (I.ii). Whether he actually attends we are not informed. Juliet is told to look for him there, but she later protests to her mother that Paris has not yet come to woo her (III.v). On the day after the dance he appears in the Capulet home, apparently on wooing bent, but does not see Juliet because of her supposed grieving for Tybalt's death. On that occasion Capulet promises that the marriage shall take place three days later (III.iv). Juliet's reluctance to wed, Paris seems never to suspect. He is next seen visiting Friar Laurence, evidently to engage his services for the wedding; there accidentally he meets

³This listing of functions is my own, but after making it I was materially helped by checking with F. G. Stokes's *Shakespeare Dictionary of Characters*, London, G. G. Harrap, 1924.

⁴Strunk, *op. cit.*, p. xv, states that Shakespeare "represents the ball as given by Capulet with the express purpose of furthering the suit of Paris," and he practically repeats the statement on p. 109. I can discover no ground for this assertion.

Juliet, who neatly turns his witty compliments⁵ and receives his "holy kiss" (IV.i). He is up betimes on his wedding morning, coming with Friar Laurence and musicians to greet his bride. Finding her dead, he is the most silent of the mourners and possibly the most sincere (IV.v). Finally he is discovered strewing flowers on Juliet's grave with a promise to do so nightly, when he is interrupted by Romeo, who attempts to force his way into the tomb. Defending, as he believes, the honor of his lady love, he struggles with Romeo in an attempt to arrest him, but is slain. With his last breath he begs to be laid by Juliet (V.iii). Thus Shakespeare in ennobling his character makes Paris a rival to Romeo throughout the play and his proper foil, observing all the niceties of conventional society as Romeo disregards most of them so violently. To cap the story Shakespeare has protagonist slay antagonist in the final scene just as Prince Hal slays Hotspur, Edgar slays Edmund, and Hamlet slays both Claudius and Laertes. Now of all these incidents involving Paris Shakespeare is indebted to Brooke for only two: one interview between Capulet and Paris after Tybalt's death, and one between Juliet and Paris when she pretends to receive kindly his attentions. In each of these two cases the circumstances of the meeting differ greatly from those given by Shakespeare.

Mercutio, it is generally known, is mentioned by Brooke only once in his poem, when "as a lion bold" he seizes Juliet's hand at the dance, only to have Romeo gain her gratitude and affection by pressing the other palm in his.

⁵I cannot agree with Stokes, *op. cit.*, p. 245, that Paris "is rebuffed" by Juliet. She explains to her father that she gave the "youthful lord . . . what becomed love I might." In Brooke she goes much further with her flirtation. To modern minds she may seem somewhat free with her kisses of both Romeo and Paris, and I have heard comment in the theatre on this point. But the Dutch scholar Erasmus a half-century before Shakespeare was impressed with the liberal kissing habits of beautiful young English girls whom he met. See Preserved Smith, *Erasmus*, *passim*.

This triviality Shakespeare has rejected, though it is seemingly echoed in Romeo's frequent mention of "palm to palm" at the corresponding point in his narrative. Mercutio's qualities of boldness in speech and action are stressed whenever he appears. Shakespeare makes him akin to the Prince (III.i.114, 194), on friendly terms with both hostile families (I.ii.71), but fonder of the Montagues and particularly averse to Tybalt and his manner of fighting (II.iv). So he goes with Romeo to the Capulet ball, and an entire scene is built around his lyric description of Queen Mab (I.iv). He does not speak in the dance scene, but is full of speech on the way home and orally castigates Romeo, concealed but within hearing (II.i). When they meet again next day, Romeo, flushed with victory in love, is more than a match for him in a combat of wits, as Mercutio acknowledges. The Nurse comes, and Mercutio turns upon her the battery of his all too free verbiage, in the face of which she is silenced though she grows bolder in his absence (II.iv). On his final appearance Mercutio devotes his attention to the staid Benvolio, who is utterly helpless before his burst of wit. Mercutio, having rejected Benvolio's sage advice to retire, deliberately picks a quarrel with Tybalt, whom he so despises, and then takes up Romeo's quarrel when the latter avoids fighting his new-made cousin. Tybalt slays Mercutio, partly by accident resulting from Romeo's well-meant interference, and half-jesting Mercutio, as he is carried away to die, blames it all on Romeo and the hostile houses (III.i). Thus his death and his final censure of Romeo furnish an entirely different motive from that assigned by Brooke for Romeo's slaying of Tybalt. He does this in open fight, it is true, but with the avowed desire to kill in revenge for the death of his friend. This new motive accords with the rule of Senecan tragedy. That Mercutio should fight Tybalt and be the direct cause of his death Shakespeare makes perfectly logical, though neither *motif* is in Brooke.

Benvolio is in Brooke an unnamed companion to Romeus, "far more than he with counsel filled, and riper for his years" (l.102), who advises Romeus to bestow his affections

elsewhere than on an unloving lady for the sake of his parents. Romeus at once accepts this wise advice and decides to go to all assemblies possible. Then his whole function ceases. In Shakespeare throughout the first half of the play he is the sober foil to Mercutio and disappears from the plot with the scene of the latter's death.⁶ For the first three acts he is of service. In contrast to the furious Tybalt, bent on fighting in the opening scene, he tries to beat down the weapons of both parties, but is forced by Tybalt to fight in self-defense. Fortunately, no harm comes of this brawl, and Benvolio is able to give his uncle Montague a dispassionate account of it a few minutes later. He is then called to the more delicate task of discovering the cause of Romeo's melancholy, a service in which he is more successful than are Rosencrantz and Guildenstern in a later tragedy. Learning from Romeo the full truth of his unreturned love, he wisely advises the examination of other beauties. Here Romeo is slow to accept the sage counsel (I.i). Still Benvolio urges, and learning by chance of the Capulet assembly, to which both Mercutio and Rosaline are invited, he shrewdly suggests this occasion to be a fit one for Romeo to compare his lady with others and carries his point (I.ii). He accompanies Romeo to the dance (I.iv), starts home with him and guesses his manner of escape (II.i), carefully inquires about him next day, and learns that Tybalt has sent "a letter" to the house, listens patiently to all Mercutio's tirade on Tybalt, and then retires when the Nurse asks for a private interview with Romeo (II.iv). The last time that he appears he is again the pacifist, this time vainly attempting to restrain Mercutio despite the latter's unfounded slander of Benvolio's quiet disposition. Apparently he does not interfere in the Tybalt-Mercutio duel, as does Romeo, but when Mercutio is wounded, he bears away the body and returns to announce the death to unhappy Romeo. After Romeo has revenged

⁶Perhaps his unexplained disappearance led some crude reviser to insert in the last scene of the probably pirated First Quarto the line: "And young *Benuolio* is deceased, too."

the death on Tybalt, Benvolio counsels immediate flight, but himself stays to give the Prince a somewhat biased account of the fray.

Brooke mentions Tybalt only in the one fatal fight, in which he leads the Capulet faction, will not listen to Romeo urging for peace, and dies deservedly. Shakespeare has him always brawling. As we have seen, he is determined on fight in the opening scene, where he proclaims to Benvolio his hate of "hell, all Montagues, and thee." At Capulet's ball he is resolved to fight Romeo as soon as he discovers his intrusion, and quarrels so with his uncle-host when the latter interferes with his plan that the nephew withdraws in a huff, presumably to pen the challenge to Romeo that Benvolio hears of next morning. His fight with Mercutio has already been related and ascribed to Shakespeare's invention. Romeo is the man he seeks, however, and he rejoices in the opportunity that comes to fight the Montague heir immediately after news is brought of Mercutio's death. Thus Tybalt's violent end satisfies poetic justice, and the mourning for him seems to be a matter of family honor rather than an expression of hearty grief. Throughout the three scenes in which Tybalt figures he is given over to violent action, and is the one member of the two houses that will not suffer the feud to cool.

Shakespeare's Capulet trails closely the functions given him in Brooke. Yet there are changes. His looking with favor on Paris's proposal for Juliet, coupled with an invitation to his "feast" (I.ii), and his quarrel with Tybalt at this assembly have already been mentioned. Brooke does state that some of the Capulets objected to Romeo's presence at the dance, but he does not mention names. In this scene (I.v) Capulet's trait of hospitality, suggested by Brooke, is beautifully developed. He is the ideal host, attentive to all his guests, chatting easily with young and old, unwilling to have Tybalt mar the occasion by a brawl, even in defense of family honor, and pressing the unbidden guests to stay when they prepare to go an hour later than his usual bedtime. But in the climactic scene of conflict with Juliet over the Paris match his display of temper is altogether unlovely

until both his wife and the Nurse rebuke him (III.v).⁷ Two brief scenes that follow add delicate touches to complete the portrait of the testy head of the Capulet house. On learning that Juliet is willing to marry Paris he immediately hastens by one day the date of the wedding (IV.ii), and tries to make up for this act of impatience by playing the housewife in the kitchen and so getting in everyone's way (IV.iv).

For Lady Capulet Shakespeare owes to Brooke very little. She is practically unmentioned in the poem until she finds Juliet mourning after Romeo's banishment and imagines that her grief springs from the death of Tybalt. This Juliet denies, and her mother, disturbed as is Lady Montague in Shakespeare over her son, carries her worries to her husband, who thereupon seeks Paris as a husband to console Juliet, and sends news of this through Lady Capulet to the expected bride. Later it is to the mother that Juliet pretends a change of heart after her interview with Friar Laurence. This affectionate mother Shakespeare transforms into the twenty-eight-year-old (I.ii.72) wife of Old Capulet, who on her first appearance sarcastically cries to her husband: "A crutch! a crutch! Why call you for a sword?" (I.i). Again she appears in conversation with Juliet and the Nurse, favoring the match with Paris, but seemingly without affection for her daughter or knowledge of her nature (I.iii). At the assembly her presence is mentioned though she does not speak (I.v), and she is altogether absent from Act II, when Juliet is wooed and wed. On Romeo's killing of Tybalt Lady Capulet at once denounces Benvolio's story as false and demands immediate death for Romeo (III.i). Her desire for revenge she again exemplifies to her daughter in declaring her intention to send poison to Mantua and kill the "traitor murderer" (III.v). With slight compression of time she now plays the rôle of

⁷Editors of the play seem in this scene to have uniformly overlooked the influence of Lyly's *Euphues*, convincingly shown by R. W. Bond in the Introduction to his edition of Lyly's works.

message-bearer as in Brooke, exhibiting more lack of sympathy for her daughter (III.iv, v). The same coldness appears just before Juliet is to take the sleeping potion (IV.ii, iii), and though a busy housekeeper, she finds time to exhibit both her sarcasm and her jealousy in the midst of preparing for the wedding feast (IV.iv). Among mourners for her daughter she is the loudest (IV.v), and on discovery of Juliet's actual corpse she speaks of Death as warning her "old age to a sepulchre" (V.iii). Most of these incidents are in themselves unimportant, but they follow a logical sequence in developing a mother unloving and unloved.

A direct antithesis to this cold, sarcastic young wife and mother is Lady Montague, who in one scene speaks just three lines (I.i), is silently present in another scene (III.i), and by the closing scene is dead of a broken heart over her son's misfortunes. Her first speech is to keep her husband out of the brawl; her next is to rejoice that her young son was not a participant, though she anxiously inquires of his whereabouts. Likewise Old Montague shows uneasiness over the habits of his lovelorn boy (I.i), defends him before the Prince after the slaying of Tybalt (III.i), and is chief mourner over his dead body, though ready to erect a gold statue for Juliet (V.i). Shakespeare found in Brooke nothing of importance about either parent, but has deliberately undertaken to contrast them with the Capulets.

The Nurse to Juliet speaks in no less than twelve scenes of the play (I.iii, v; II.ii, iv, v; III.ii, iii, v; IV.ii, iii, iv, v). Her two functions as a trusted servant in the Capulet household and as confidential messenger between the lovers lend importance to the rôle she plays. But in almost every instance Shakespeare is merely following the details of Brooke's story. Variations occur when the dramatist has the Nurse present and intervening in the first conversation between Lady Capulet and her daughter as to the match with Paris, in the course of which conversation the Nurse gives us certain biographical details that Brooke has her relate to Romeus (I.iii). In the play she does not, as in

Brooke, accompany Juliet to the Friar for her marriage. But she brings to Juliet in Shakespeare the ill news of Tybalt's death and Romeo's banishment (III.ii). In the two brief scenes of preparation for the wedding feast (IV.ii, iv) the Nurse seems to be assisting Lady Capulet in pantry and kitchen, therein to be definitely named as "good Angelica." Brooke has her severely punished for secreting her knowledge of the Romeus-Juliet affair, but Shakespeare, in keeping with her comic character, does not mention her at all in his tragic conclusion.

Friar Laurence appears in seven scenes of the play (II.iii, vi; III.iii; IV.i, v; V.ii. iii), and in all but two of these says and does practically the same as in Brooke. The two changes involved are unimportant. In one he is speaking to Paris about his wedding plans immediately prior to the entry of Juliet and his suggestion to her of the sleeping potion (IV.i). In the other scene he is present to comfort the Capulet family in the supposed death of Juliet (IV.v). All that he does conforms to the conventional duties of the parish priest. Brooke gives us a little more detail as to the Friar's actual performance of the wedding rites. Brooke takes a peculiar interest in ecclesiastical lore.

Brooke's Peter is servant to Romeus, taking the place of Balthasar in Shakespeare. Shakespeare's Peter is attendant on the Nurse (II.iv, v), and in the Capulet home teases the Musicians, who "get no gold for sounding" (IV.v). Like Sampson, Gregory, and Abraham, all of whom appear only in the opening scene, Peter is strictly a comic figure, invented probably to make room for some comedian like Kemp in Shakespeare's company.

To sum up: of fifteen minor characters in the play, Shakespeare leaves the functions of three, the Nurse, Peter, new christened Balthasar, and Friar Laurence, practically as he found them in Brooke; he slightly modifies and adds to the action of Capulet; he notably changes and makes far more important the parts played by Paris and Tybalt in the plot; and he develops out of mere hints given by Brooke the respective rôles of Mercutio, Benvolio, Lady Capulet, Montague, and Lady Montague, besides creating the comic

figures of Peter, Sampson, Gregory, and Abraham. All this shows vastly more interest in complicating the plot of *Romeo* than is sometimes recognized, and a keen desire to give substance and consistency to the minor figures of the story.

II

Twin-Born Scenarios

Any close analysis of the structure of *Romeo and Juliet* will make clear the use by Shakespeare of two pairs of largely duplicated scenarios in this play. The first pair is the first scene of Act I and the first scene of Act III; the second is Act II, scene v, and Act III, scene ii. In each case Shakespeare seems to have taken a set of incidents from Brooke to form one scene, and then to have used the same set of incidents again to form a second scene.

That Brooke does not begin his story as does Shakespeare with a street brawl between Capulets and Montagues is well known. He opens the poem with a description of Verona, followed by an expository account of the Capulet-Montague feud. No specific fight between the rival houses does he mention except that in which Romeo slays Tybalt after vainly endeavoring to persuade the Capulet leader to keep the peace. To his representation of this brawl Shakespeare, in his third Act, adds the death of Mercutio and the part played by Benvolio before and after the actual conflict. He first has two Montague sympathizers conversing about the feud, one anxious to fight, the other to avoid hostilities. Tybalt enters, looking for trouble, insults Romeo as soon as he sees him, but receives a peaceable response, which leads to the struggle between Mercutio and Tybalt and the former's death. Tybalt returns, Romeo fights, slays him, and flees. Enter Capulet, Lady Capulet, Montague, Lady Montague, and Prince Escalus. Benvolio, an eye-witness, gives his account of the brawl, and the Prince passes sentence on Romeo.

Now compare the opening scene of the play. Two Capulet sympathizers are conversing about the feud, one belligerent, the other less so. Tybalt enters, looking for trouble, and as soon as he sees Benvolio, forces him to fight against his will. Enter Capulet, Lady Capulet, Montague, Lady Montague, and Prince Escalus. By dire threats the Prince procures peace. Benvolio, an eyewitness, gives an account of the fight. Clearly Shakespeare has written one scene and then duplicated it with slight variations of the action.

So it is with the other pair of scenes. Act II, scene v, closely follows Brooke. First, Shakespeare has Juliet soliloquize on the slowness of the Nurse in bringing news from Romeo. The Nurse enters, as in Brooke, toys with Juliet in complaining of her own bodily ailments and praising Romeo but holds back her news until she has teased Juliet sufficiently. Then she delivers the message. Act III, scene ii, notably departs from the corresponding account in Brooke, who does not make the Nurse the bearer of the ill tidings of Tybalt's death. Shakespeare has Juliet first soliloquize on her impatience in awaiting the expected visit of Romeo after their marriage and the message from him to be brought by the Nurse. The Nurse enters with her news, but she toys with Juliet some time before announcing it, meanwhile using ambiguous language that makes Juliet believe both Romeo and Tybalt are dead. After tormenting her young mistress for a while the Nurse tells the full truth and bears a message to Romeo hiding in the Friar's cell. With slight variations, then, Shakespeare is repeating his scenario. The two pairs of scenes furnish a fine example of Shakespeare's reluctance to invent entirely new situations.

III

Nature of Verbal and Sentence Echoes

Much is said of the lines of Brooke echoed in the play, but so far as I know, no one has attempted to analyze the nature of these echoes, or to determine whether the

dramatist was likely to repeat a particular word, thought, or image caught from the lines of his humble predecessor. Yet in this case the repetitions are so numerous and so palpable that classification of them is sure to possess interest even if it does not cast light on the poet's habit of thought. The lists below are by no means exhaustive and are presented with no claim to finality in classification. They may easily suggest more questions than they will answer.

(1) *Lines Practically Repeated:*

Br. 1.353: (Nurse to Juliet)

His name is Romeus (said she) a Montague.

Sh. I.v.132: (Nurse to Juliet)

His name is Romeo and a Montague.

Br. 1.1353: (Friar to Romeus)

Art thou (quoth he) a man? Thy shape saith so thou art.

Sh. III.iii.109: (Friar to Romeo)

Art thou a man? Thy form cries out thou art.

(2) *Striking Words or Phrases Repeated:*

Br. 1.116: (Of Rosaline)

Love's court she hath forsworn.

Sh. I.i.229: (Of Rosaline)

She hath forsworn to love.

Br. 1.158: (Capulet)

Spareth for no cost.

Sh. IV.iv.6: *Capulet*.

Spare not for cost.

Br. 1.2190: (Friar to Juliet)

That no inconstant toy thee let thy promise to fulfill.

Sh. IV.i.119-20: (Friar to Juliet)

If no inconstant toy, nor womanish fear abate thy valor.

Br. 1.2276: (Paris asks Capulet)

The marriage knot to knit soon up.

Sh. IV.ii.24: *Cap*.

I'll have this knot knit up to-morrow morning.

Br. 1.554: (Juliet to Romeo)

To cease your suit and suffer her to live among her likes.

Sh. II.ii.152: (Juliet to Romeo)

To cease thy suit and leave me to my grief.

Br. 1.2274: (Of Paris)

His heart thinks long for their appointed hour.

Sh. IV.v.41: *Paris*.

Have I thought long to see this morning's face

Br. 1.2459: (After Juliet takes potion)

If ever there hath been a lamentable day.

Sh. IV.v.17, 25: (After Juliet takes potion) *Nurse*.

O lamentable day.

Sh. IV.v.50: *Nurse*.

Most lamentable day.

Br. 1.2585: (Of the poison)

This is the speeding gear.

Sh. V.i.60: (Of the poison)

Such soon-speeding gear.

Br. 1.899:

She showed a field-bed ready dight.

Sh. II.i.40:

This field-bed is too cold for me to sleep.

(3) *Thought Repeated in New Words:*

Br. 1.830: (Of Romeus)

So light he wox he leapt the wall.

Sh. II.ii.66: *Romeo*.

With love's light wings did I o'erperch these walls.

Br. 1.730: (Juliet asks)

If Friar Laurence leisure had to hear her shrift.

Sh. IV. i.37: (Juliet asks)

Are you at leisure, holy father, now?

Br. 11.2453-4: (Of Capulet)

He ne had the power his daughter to bewEEP

Ne yet to speak.

Sh. IV.v.30-1: *Cap*.

Death . . . Ties up my tongue and will not let me speak.

Br. 11.492-3: (Juliet to Romeus)

In this place and at this time to hazard it you dare.

What if your deadly foes, my kinsmen, saw you here?

Sh. II.ii.64-5: (Juliet to Romeo)

And the place death, considering who thou art

If any of my kinsmen find thee here.

(4) *Thought Condensed in Phrasing:*

Br. I.1354: (Friar to Romeus)

Thy crying and thy weeping eyes denote a woman's heart.

Sh. III.iii.110: (Friar to Romeo)

Thy tears are womanish.

Br. II.1983-4: (Cap. to Juliet)

Advise thee well, and say that thou art warned now,
And think not that I speak in sport or mind to break my vow.

Sh. III.v.190: *Cap.*

Look to 't, think on 't, I do not use to jest.

Br. II.2326-30: (Juliet)

This night my purpose is to pray
Unto the heavenly minds, that dwell above the skies,
And order all the course of things, as they can best devise,
That they so smile upon the doings of to-morrow
That all the remnant of my life shall be exempt from sorrow.

Sh. IV.iii.3-4: *Jul.*

I have need of many orisons
To move the heavens to smile upon my state.

Br. II.2370-2: (Juliet)

How shall I that alway have in so fresh air been bred
Endure the loathed stink of such an heaped store
Of carcasses not yet consumed?

Sh. IV.iii.35: *Jul.*

To whose foul mouth no healthsome air breathes in.

Br. II.2372-4: (Juliet)

Bones that long before
Intombed were, where I my sleeping place shall have,
Where all my ancestors do rest.

Sh. IV.iii.40-1: *Jul.*

Where for these many hundred years the bones
Of all my buried ancestors are pack'd.

Br. I.2418: (Of Nurse discovering Juliet)

She found her parts were stiff,

Sh. IV.v.26: (Of Nurse discovering Juliet)

Her joints are stiff.

Br. II.2523-5:

Another use there is, that whosoever dies,

Borne to their church with open face, upon the bier he
lies

In wonted weed attired, not wrapt in winding sheet.

Sh. IV.v.80-1:

And as the custom is,

In all her best array bear her to church.

Br. l.2604: (Romeus)

Hath caused ink and paper to be brought.

Sh. V.i.25: *Rom.*

Get me ink and paper.

Br. l.2612: (Of Romeus)

And then a post horse doth he hire.

Sh. V.i.26: *Rom.*

And hire post horses.

Br. ll.2665-6: (Romeus to Tybalt's corpse)

What more amends, or cruel wreak desirest thou

To see on me, than this which here is shewed forth to
thee now?

Sh. V.iii.98: *Romeo* (To Tybalt's corpse)

What more favor can I do to thee?

(5) *Thought Expanded by the Use of Specific Detail:*

Br. l.1860: (Cap.)

Scarce saw she yet full sixteen years: too young to
be a bride.

Sh. I.ii.8-10: *Capulet*

She hath not seen the change of fourteen years:

Let two more summers wither in their pride

Ere we may think her ripe to be a bride.

Br. l.2394: (Of Juliet)

And lest they will dismember her she greatly stands
in doubt.

Sh. IV.iii.54-5: *Juliet.*

And, in this rage, with some great kinsman's bone,

As with a club, dash out my desperate brains.

Br. ll.2375-6: (Juliet)

Shall not the Friar and my Romeus, when they come,
Find me (if I awake before) ystified in the tomb?

Sh. IV.iii.30-4: *Juliet.*

How if, when I am laid into the tomb,

I wake before the time that Romeo

Come to redeem me? there's a fearful point!

Shall I not then be stifled in the vault?

Br. I.2408: (Nurse)

The Earl will raise you by and by.

Sh. IV.v.10-1: *Nurse*.

Ay, let the County take you in your bed;
He'll fright you up i' faith.

Br. II.2569-70:

And in his shop he saw his boxes were but few,
And in his window of his wares there was so small a
shew.

Sh. V.i.42-8:

And in his needy shop a tortoise hung,
An alligator stuff'd, and other skins
Of ill-shap'd fishes; and about his shelves
A beggarly account of empty boxes,
Green earthen pots, bladders, and musty seeds,
Remnants of packthread and old cakes of roses,
Were thinly scatter'd to make up a show.

(6) *Repetition in Structure of Sentence:*

Br. II.427-8:

For so perchance this new alliance may procure
Unto our houses such a peace as ever shall endure.

Sh. II.iv.91-2:

For this alliance may so happy prove
To turn your household's rancor to pure love.

Br. I.479:

And what love fears, that love laments.

Sh. II.ii.68:

And what love can do, that dares love attempt.

Br. I.324: (Romeus learns)

Her father was a Capulet, and master of the feast.

Sh. I.v.15: (Romeo learns)

Her mother is the lady of the house.

Br. I.347: (Juliet)

What twain are those (quoth she) which press unto
the door?

Sh. I.v.132: *Juliet*.

What's he that now is going out of door?

Br. II.860-1:

Let Fortune do and death their worst to me;
Full recompensed am I for all my passed harms.

Sh. II.v.7-8:

Let love-devouring death do what he dare:
It is enough I may but call her mine.

Br. l.1011:

I but part the fray.

Sh. I.i.75:

I do but keep the peace.

Br. l.2321: (Juliet)

I pray you, leave me here alone this night.

Sh. IV.iii.2: *Jul.*

I pray thee, leave me to myself to-night.

Br. II.2361-2: (Juliet)

What do I know (quoth she) if that this powder shall
Sooner or later than it should, or else not work at all?

Sh. IV.iii.21: *Jul.*

What if this mixture do not work at all?

Br. II.2510-1:

And now the wedding weeds for mourning weeds they
change,

And Hymenë into a dirge.

Sh. IV.v.87-8:

Our wedding cheer to a sad burial feast,
Our solemn hymns to sullen dirges change.

Br. "To the Reader," final couplet:

The while, I pray, that ye with favour blame,
Or rather not reprove the laughing game.

Sh. "Prologue," final couplet:

The which if you with patient ears attend,
What here shall miss, our toil shall strive to mend.

(7) *Repetition of Striking Image:*

Br. l.218:

Through them he swalloweth down love's sweet im-
poison'd bait.

Sh. Prol. II, 8:

And she steal love's sweet bait from poison'd hooks.

Br. l.457:

But when on earth the night her mantle black hath
spread.

Sh. II.2.75:

I have night's cloak to hide me from their sight.

Br. l.1603: (Juliet threatens)

Headlong to throw herself down from the window's
height,

Sh. IV.i.77: *Jul.*

O bid me leap, rather than marry Paris,
From off the battlements of yonder tower.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY IMITATION OF *ROMEO AND JULIET*

BY ARTHUR M. SAMPLEY

The Shakespeare Allusion-Book lists only one imitation of *Romeo and Juliet* before 1600,¹ and that occurs in the undated play *Wily Beguilde*. The present trend of critical opinion, however, is to date this play, previously thought to have been produced as early as 1596, c. 1602–1606.² Another imitation of Shakespeare's early tragedy occurs in *The Shoemakers' Holiday*, 1599, as Professor Robert Adger Law has recently pointed out.³

There is, however, some parallelism between *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Death of Robert Earle of Huntington*, which was written in 1598.⁴ Two situations in the latter play remind one of Shakespeare's piece. In the first place, King John and two friends attend a ball given by Fitzwater, uninvited; they are masked and have torch-bearers go before them. In the course of the ball King John dances with Matilda and makes love to her. In general situation this incident is like Act I, scenes iv–v, in *Romeo and Juliet*, where Romeo, Mercutio, and Benvolio proceed in masques and with torch-bearers to a ball in the house of Capulet.

I would not press this parallel if it were not connected with a more striking one. Before the arrival of the masquers, Lester has been negotiating with Fitzwater for the marriage of the latter's daughter, Matilda, to the son

¹There is an allusion to *Romeo and Juliet* by John Marston in *The Scourge of Villanie*, 1598. A possible echo of the play in this volume turns out to be a common phrase of the day. See *The Shakespeare Allusion-Book*, I, 52–53.

²See E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, IV, p. 53, and Baldwin Maxwell, *Studies in Philology*, XIX, p. 206 ff.

³"*The Shoemakers' Holiday* and *Romeo and Juliet*," *Studies in Philology*, XXI, pp. 356–361.

⁴"From 20 Feb. to 8 March [1598] he [Henslowe] paid Munday and Chettle sums amounting to £5 for a . . . 'seconde parte of the downefall of earllee Huntyngton.'"—*The Elizabethan Stage*, III, 447.

of Wigmore, Lord of the March. Finding his daughter still mournful because of the death of Robin Hood, Fitzwater says,

Why how now votary? still at your booke?
Euer in mourning weedes?⁵

So Capulet, wishing to marry Juliet to the County Paris and seeing her sad because, as he supposes, of Tybalt's death, cries,

How now! a conduit, girl? what, still in tears?
Evermore showering?⁶

Lady Capulet has previously made a similar remark:

Evermore weeping for your cousin's death?⁷

Fitzwater continues his remonstrance:

Some sorrow fits: but this is more than neede.⁸

Similarly, Lady Capulet had said:

Some grief shows much of love;
But much of grief shows still some want of wit.⁹

The account given of young Wigmore, to whom Fitzwater desires to betroth Matilda, runs as follows:

There is the noble *Wigmore*, lord of the March,
That lyes on *Wye*, *Lug*, and the *Severne* streames,
His sonne is like the sunnes syres *Ganymede*.¹⁰

This account is not unlike Capulet's recommendation of Paris:

A gentleman of noble parentage,
Of fair demesnes, youthful, and nobly train'd.¹¹

When just after this scene the masquers come in, Matilda at first refuses to dance with King John, but urged by her

⁵*Death of Robert Earle of Huntington*, sig. E 3v.

⁶*Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 130-131.

⁷*Ibid.*, III, v, 70.

⁸*Death of Robert Earle of Huntington*, E 3v.

⁹*Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 73-74.

¹⁰*Death of Robert Earle of Huntington*, E 3v.

¹¹*Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 181-182.

father, she consents. Discovering who her partner is, Matilda flings away from him. Thereupon Fitzwater again remonstrates with his daughter:

Daunce out your Galliard: Gods deare holibread,
Y'are too forgetfull: daunce, or by my troth,
You'l moue my patience more than I will speake.¹²

Fitzwater's impatience and profanity are like those of Capulet when Juliet refuses to wed Paris:

God's bread! it makes me mad.¹³

The double parallelism involving here two scenes from *Romeo and Juliet* and two from the *Death of Robert* and supported by verbal echoes seems to me to show that Munday or Chettle, whichever of the two it was who wrote this part of the play, was echoing Shakespeare. If such indebtedness actually exist, it is a notable fact that the three earliest imitations of *Romeo and Juliet* all drew on Act III, scene v, in which Capulet so harshly commands Juliet to marry against her will. Furthermore, the fact that *Romeo and Juliet* was imitated by two different playwrights before 1600 shows something of the vogue of the play.

As a means of strengthening the case for Munday's borrowing from Shakespeare, I subjoin two parallels from the *Downfall of Robert Earle of Huntington*:

Downfall, sig. H 1r:

This carpet knight sits carping at our scarres,
And ieasts at those most glorious well fought warres.

Romeo and Juliet, II, ii, 1:

He jests at scars that never felt a wound.

Downfall, K 3v:

Be not offended that I touch thy shrine
Make this hand happie, let it folde in thine.

Romeo and Juliet, I, v, 95-98:

If I profane with my unworhiest hand
This holy shrine, the gentle fine is this:
My lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready stand
To smoothe that rough touch with a tender kiss.

¹²*Death of Robert Earle of Huntington*, F 1v.

¹³*Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 177.

AN INTERPRETATION OF POE'S "AL AARAAF"

BY FLOYD STOVALL

Al Aaraaf is a notoriously obscure poem, but it is not, as some have supposed, unintelligible. It was certainly never intended by its author as a hoax.¹ On the contrary, it was a serious and ambitious attempt to produce a great poem. Its obscurity is partly due to imperfections of style. Fragmentary and rambling sentences, ambiguous punctuation, confusion of images, inadequate transitions, and seemingly irrelevant parentheses and allusions conspire to perplex the unwary reader. But imperfections of style obscure only the details. More serious are the defects in structure, because they obscure the whole conception of the poem. Unless sustained by patience and determination, therefore, the reader may conclude that Poe was not master of his own thoughts—that, literally, he did not know what he was talking about. Such a conclusion, however, if not altogether false, would surely be unjust. *Al Aaraaf* is not a masterpiece, to be sure, but rather a *potpourri* of undigested materials and purposes that converge to no focus; yet it requires no clairvoyance to discern, running through it in shadowy outline, the purposive vision projected uncertainly from the poet's mind.

Some of the difficulties of style have been eliminated by the diligence and insight of editors and other commentators. What remains to be explained is not of vital importance to the essential meaning of the poem. I do not intend here to deal specifically with such matters, believing, as I do, that the chief problem yet unsolved is one of structure. The primary aim of this paper, then, is to rediscover, as far as possible, the underlying plan or pattern of the poem, reduce this plan to its structural elements, and then analyze and

¹Professor Charles W. Kent suggests the possibility that the poem was not meant to be understood. A brief review of opinions is given by Professor Killis Campbell in his edition of Poe's poems, p. 173. All quotations from the poems in this paper follow Professor Campbell's text.

refashion these elements in such a manner as to reveal their individual significance as well as their relation to one another and to the general plan.

The underlying plan of *Al Aaraaf* might be illustrated by a chart of the stellar universe, with three slight modifications: increasing the relative size of the Earth, adding a prominent star the movements of which are independent of the law of gravity, and localizing God and Heaven in the region without and above this material universe, visible but unapproachable. Through the added star, which is Al Aaraaf, rays of influence flow from God to all parts of the cosmos. The poem is thus a representation, mainly pictorial, of the relation of God to the whole universe, but to the inhabitants of Earth and Al Aaraaf in particular, expressed in terms of power and beauty. Professor Campbell has noted that its central idea is "the divineness of beauty."² Professor Woodberry thinks Poe's purpose was to show that "beauty is the direct revelation of the divine to mankind, and the protection of the soul against sin."³ Similarly, Professor Émile Lauvrière finds in the poem the doctrine of "*la Beauté suffisant à l'homme pour l'éclairer et le sauver*."⁴ These interpretations, though excellent so far as they go, take no account of the fact, clearly revealed in the poem, that God sometimes manifests His deity in a show of power.⁵ In its emphasis upon God's rule by power, and in many other ways, *Al Aaraaf* is not unlike *Paradise Lost*,⁶ it is different, however, in being descriptive and fanciful, whereas Milton's poem is in quality dramatic and realistic.

Three separate threads, constituting the three structural elements of the poem, are confusedly interwoven to form this general pattern. Each element has its own theme or motif, separately conceived apparently, which the poet has

²*Poe's Poems*, p. 173.

³*Life of Poe*, I, pp. 61-62.

⁴*Edgar Poe, sa vie et son oeuvre*, p. 333.

⁵Power is a form of beauty, too, but terrible rather than fair. See *Al Aaraaf*, I, 84-85.

⁶Professor Campbell has pointed out several resemblances in details in his notes to Poe's poem, pp. 174 ff.

attempted with but indifferent success to unite with its fellows in conformity with the general theme. The poem fails to impress the reader with the effect of totality because he loses his way where the threads cross, and finds himself in a maze with no definite goal in sight. Once having discovered its separate themes and elements, however, and disentangled its threads of thought, broken in places yet generally traceable, we shall find *Al Aaraaf* not only more intelligible than before, but more significant in the aesthetic development of its author.

I

The first structural element has a religious motif, being concerned with man in his relation to the authority of God, particularly as that authority is manifested in the fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. It also has a secondary astronomical motif designed to explain prophecy in terms of observed phenomena, thus supplementing the religious motif. As conceived in this part of the poem *Al Aaraaf* is a material star that becomes the instrument of God in the destruction of the world.

This religious-astronomical motif, if we may think of the two as one, had its origin in a curious interest in Biblical prophecy. The existence of God Poe never doubted, and he always believed in a life of the spirit in some form after death; but he despaired of ever understanding either by the processes of mere thought.⁷ He was the more inclined, therefore, to have recourse, as he frequently did, to the imagination. He was an eager, if desultory, student of astronomy, being especially interested in such romantic problems as the existence of intelligent beings in other worlds than ours, or the possible collision of Earth with one of the heavenly spheres. Poe was willing to believe, with some reservations, that the events foretold in the

⁷*Marginalia*, in the *Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, edited by James A. Harrison, XVI, p. 135. All references to Poe's prose are to this edition.

Bible would occur literally as described.⁸ Such a catastrophe, therefore, accomplishing the destruction of the world, might easily appear to him to be the expression of the Divine Will. But he held nature to be the outward expression of the law of God, single and infallible, yet providing for every possible contingency.⁹ How, then, it may be asked, did he reconcile the wandering star with the law of gravity? Though he did not inform us, we may be sure that he could have done so by that specious mode of reasoning, doubtless sincere, to establish a favorite theory, in which subsequently, as in *Eureka*, he demonstrated his skill.

It is unnecessary to explain Poe's interest in the theory of the destruction of the world by collision with a star or a comet, for men have speculated upon that question for centuries. But his interest was quickened by his having somewhere in his early reading come across an account of the "new star" discovered by Tycho Brahe in the sixteenth century.¹⁰ In a footnote on the title of his poem Poe makes the following statement: "A star was discovered by Tycho Brahe which burst forth, in a moment, with a splendor surpassing that of Jupiter—then gradually faded away and became invisible." In the edition of 1845 the note was changed to read: "A star was discovered by Tycho Brahe which appeared suddenly in the heavens—attained, in a few days, a brilliancy surpassing that of Jupiter—then as suddenly disappeared, and has never been seen since." Both statements are exaggerated. Tycho first saw the star November 11, 1572, when it was as bright as Venus. In December it began to grow fainter, but did not disappear

⁸See the review of Stephens' *Arabia Petraea* (*New York Review*, October, 1837), *Poe's Works*, X, p. 9; see also the review of Duncan's *Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons* (*Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, March, 1840), *Poe's Works*, X, pp. 81 ff.

⁹*Eureka*, *Poe's Works*, XVI, pp. 254-255.

¹⁰He might have read of Tycho's star in some odd corner of a newspaper, or else he might have come across the story in some book about the more famous Kepler, who was a friend and disciple of Tycho.

altogether until sixteen months subsequent to its first appearance.¹¹ The star appeared not to move in the heavens; hence Tycho declared it to be a fixed star, in the eighth sphere.¹² In a note on *Al Aaraaf* in his recent edition of the poems of Poe, Professor Mabbott suggests that the star of the poem is really a comet. That may be true; and yet Poe could not have derived such an idea from Tycho himself, who stoutly maintained that it could not be a comet because it had neither the appearance nor the motion of a comet.¹³ As an astrologer, Tycho predicted dire disaster following the appearance of this strange star. A similar star was said to have appeared at the time of Hipparchus, about 125 B.C., with terrible consequences. As the star of Bethlehem foretold the birth of Christ, it was generally supposed that the new star heralded his second coming and the end of the world.¹⁴

I see no reason for supposing that Poe thought of *Al Aaraaf* as a comet, since he everywhere refers to it as a star; nevertheless, it may be of interest to introduce here from Poe's later writings an account of what he imagined would happen if the Earth should pass through the tenuous substance of a comet. There would be an unnatural excess of oxygen in the Earth's atmosphere, the consequence of which must be immediate and omniprevalent combustion. He describes this event as one having experienced it:

For a moment there was a wild lurid light alone, visiting and penetrating all things. Then—let us bow down, Charmion, before the excessive majesty of the great God!—then, there came a shouting and pervading sound, as if from the mouth itself of Him; while the whole incumbent mass of ether in which we existed, burst at once into a species of intense flame, for whose surpassing brilliancy and all-fervid heat even the angels in the high Heaven of pure knowledge have no name. Thus ended all.¹⁵

¹¹Dreyer, J. L. E.: *Tycho Brahe*, Edinburgh, 1890, pp. 41-42. The star seems to have been noticed by others four or five days earlier.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 48. Tycho, it seems, adhered to the Ptolemaic system.

¹³*Tycho Brahe*, p. 48.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 68.

¹⁵*The Conversation of Eiros and Charmion* (1839), *Poe's Works*, III, p. 8.

Poe is here evidently attempting to portray the fulfilment of the following prophecy of the New Testament:

But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night: in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.¹⁶

Though he believed, as he said, in the literal fulfilment of Biblical prophecy, yet he did not understand the predicted destruction of the universe to involve more than the crust of the Earth. Concerning these prophecies he remarks:

We believe there are few intelligent men of the present day—few, either laymen or divines—who are still willing to think that the prophecies here referred to have any further allusion than to the orb of the earth, or, more strictly, to the crust of this orb alone.¹⁷

Poe's account of the end of the world, therefore, tallies perfectly with the Biblical prophecy as he interpreted it.

Poe also believed in the promise of the millennium after the passing of the old world: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea."¹⁸ After its "purification" by fire, the Earth, he imagines, will "clothe itself anew in the verdure and the mountain-slopes and the smiling waters of Paradise, and be rendered at length a fit dwelling-place for man:—for man the Death-purged—for man to whose now exalted intellect there should be poison in knowledge no more—for the redeemed, regenerated, blissful, and now immortal, but still for the *material*, man."¹⁹

These examples of Poe's subsequent speculations on the predicted destruction of the world throw some light upon the obscure allusions in *Al Aaraaf*. The star has just paid

¹⁶2 Peter, iv, 10. Cf. also Luke, xvii, 26–30, quoted on p. 113.

¹⁷In the review of Duncan's *Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons* (*Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, March, 1840), *Poe's Works*, X, p. 81. See also *Marginalia II*, from the *Democratic Review*, December, 1844, *Poe's Works*, XVI, p. 11.

¹⁸*Revelation*, xxi, 1.

¹⁹*The Colloquy of Monos and Una* (1841), *Poe's Works*, III, p. 205.

a visit to Earth,²⁰ but is now anchored temporarily near four bright suns,²¹ as near Heaven as it is allowed to go.²² Its mission, here assumed to be the destruction of the world, has been accomplished; hence the poem is also itself a prophecy, not a history, and this visit of the star must not be confused with the earlier one recorded by Tycho Brahe.

This mission, though not explicitly stated, is implied in various ways. God is beautiful, of course, because He is harmony, self-consistency; but His beauty has two aspects, the terrible and the fair.²³ His power is terrible. We are informed that "the stars trembled at the Deity," and that the angel Nesace hid her face among lilies to escape the fervor of His eye.²⁴ Al Aaraaf has made this visit to Earth by His direction ("Beneath thy burning eye");²⁵ it is not strange, therefore, that our world trembled at its approach like "Beauty's bust beneath man's eye."²⁶ Angelo, a Greek, was living on Earth at the time of Al Aaraaf's approach, dying at sunset before the fateful night. He remembered how strangely the light affected him that evening:

The sun-ray dropp'd, in Lemnos, with a spell
On th' Arabesque carving of a gilded hall
Wherein I sate, and on the draperied wall—
And on my eyelids—O the heavy light!
How drowsily it weigh'd them into night!²⁷

As his spirit, released from the body, soared up beyond "her airy bounds," the world

²⁰*Al Aaraaf*, I, 24–25. Earth was the favored sphere of God, but not necessarily the most obedient one. Poe is Scriptural here.

²¹*Ibid.*, I, 18. Tycho's star appeared in the constellation Cassiopeia near four stars now called β , α , γ , and κ . See *Tycho Brahe*, p. 39.

²²*Al Aaraaf*, I, 88–89.

²³*Ibid.*, I, 82–85.

²⁴*Ibid.*, I, 118–121.

²⁵*Ibid.*, I, 107–109.

²⁶*Ibid.*, II, 258–260. There is here a suggestion of shame as well as of terror.

²⁷*Al Aaraaf*, II, 203–207.

was into chaos hurl'd—
Sprang from her station, on the winds apart,
And roll'd, a flame, the fiery Heaven athwart.²⁸

Except for poetic exaggeration, this passage parallels the one already quoted from the *Conversation of Eiros and Charmion*. The world was not literally hurled into chaos, because Angelo and Ianthe are gazing upon its light from Al Aaraaf at the moment he is speaking.²⁹ Significant, and yet puzzling, are the last two lines of Angelo's account of the world's end:

Dread star! that came, amid a night of mirth,
A red Daedalion on the timid Earth.³⁰

Al Aaraaf was a "dread star" because of its mission of destruction. Its coming "amid a night of mirth" was in fulfilment of another Biblical prophecy:

And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot: they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the son of man is revealed.³¹

The phrase "red Daedalion" is ambiguous. The adjective implies destructiveness; Mars, for example, gives off a red light. The astrologers of Tycho Brahe's time read disaster in the red light of the new star.³² The noun, evidently derived from "Daedalus," was chosen, I suppose, to suggest the transforming power of Al Aaraaf, as seen in the marvelous change produced on Earth by its coming.

One may ask why man and his world should be destroyed. The poem answers the question fully, and in the same way

²⁸*Ibid.*, II, 234-236.

²⁹*Ibid.*, II, 194-197.

³⁰*Ibid.*, II, 243-244.

³¹Luke, xvii, 26-30.

³²Tycho's star was first white, then yellow, then red, and finally a lead color. See *Tycho Brahe*, p. 42.

that it is answered in the book of *Genesis*. God created man in His own image, but He formed him out of the dust of the Earth, and He withheld from him knowledge, which is of Heaven. Knowledge is bad for man because his intellect is incapable of mastering it; misused, it works confusion. The desire for knowledge on the part of our first parents brought sin into the world "and all our woe," and that sin requires expiation. In the Millennium, after the world has been purified by fire, knowledge will no longer be poison to man's intellect.³³ According to *Al Aaraaf* man has sinned in three principal ways: (1) by misconceiving the true nature of God, (2) by perverting His love, and (3) by misunderstanding the means of His communication with His creatures. We know, says Nesace, that God exists, and we feel that He is eternal, but His true nature has never been revealed.³⁴ Yet some of His creatures (men, of course), seeking truth by reason alone, have come to the false conclusion that God is a Being like themselves—

Have dreamed for thy Infinity
A model of their own.³⁵

Thus the divine is debased to the level of the human, and man is led astray in his search for God.³⁶ The second sin, the perversion of God's love on Earth ("where all my love is folly"³⁷), is not as clearly defined as the first. It may mean, on the one hand, that men hold love lightly, whereas it should be the guiding principle of their lives, or, on the

³³See the passages quoted above, pp. 110 and 111, from the *Conversation of Eiros and Charmion* and the *Colloquy of Monos and Una*.

³⁴*Al Aaraaf*, I, 98-101.

³⁵*Ibid.*, I, 104-105. In his notes Poe quotes several early church authorities respecting the doctrine of anthropomorphism.

³⁶In *A Few Words About Brainard* (1842) we find: "It is needless to say, moreover, that the bestowing upon Deity a human form, is at best a low and most unideal conception." *Poe's Works*, XI, p. 21. The authorities on anthropomorphism quoted in the note to *Al Aaraaf* are also quoted here.

³⁷*Al Aaraaf*, I, 135.

other, that God's love is wasted upon the human race because they have refused to obey the laws of life that love has dictated; it very probably means both.³⁸ The third sin, as God informs Nesace, is the misunderstanding of His way of revealing Himself—

and the crowd
Still think my terrors but the thunder cloud,
The storm, the earthquake, and the ocean wrath
(Ah! will they cross me in my angrier path?).³⁹

The implication is that men have erred in interpreting God solely by the phenomena of nature, which are inadequate. We are left to deduce the conclusion that God may better be known through the exaltation of the soul. The line in parenthesis seems to contain a threat. The words "angrier path" doubtless refer back to the last lines of the preceding stanza, where God's voice is contrasted with the voice of nature and of the merely ideal:

A sound of silence on the startled ear
Which dreamy poets name "the music of the sphere."
Ours is a world of words: Quiet we call
"Silence"—which is the merest word of all.
All Nature speaks, and ev'n ideal things
Flap shadowy sounds from visionary wings—
But ah! not so when, thus, in realms on high
The eternal voice of God is passing by;
And the red winds are withering in the sky!⁴⁰

The terrible effect of silence was a favorite theme of Poe's. In *Silence—A Fable* he reveals the fact that of all terrors by which the courage of man may be tried, silence alone is unendurable. He is there thinking apparently of the silence of the tomb. In *Sonnet—Silence*, however, he hints at a silence more awful than that of the tomb—the silence of total annihilation, or the death of the soul. This silence may be referred to in the threat of an "angrier path" quoted above.

³⁸For further discussion of love, see below.

³⁹*Al Aaraaf*, I, 135–138.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, I, 124–132.

Although life on Earth has already been destroyed, if my interpretation is correct, yet there are beings dwelling in other worlds who should be warned. To Nesace and her subordinates God commits the charge of bearing His secrets through "the upper Heaven," endowing her for this purpose with something of His own resplendency. This time she is to leave her star at its anchorage. Through the new "light" she brings, with its revelation of more of the pure knowledge of Heaven, it is hoped that she may save these beings of other worlds from the guilt of man, and so from his condign punishment.⁴¹

II

The second structural element is built about the conception of Al Aaraaf as an Eden. I adopt the word *Eden* for lack of a more specific term to denote that abode for which Poe sometimes longed, where, apart from the passions of the heart and the excitements of the mind, the weary spirit may find rest in an eternity of dreams. The term seems the more appropriate because Poe employed it frequently, and because, unlike the word *Paradise*, it does not exclude the idea of "Lethean peace," which is associated with that abode.

Among the spirits of Al Aaraaf, which in the development of the second motif Poe describes as an immaterial world, Nesace, the queen, and Ligeia, her handmaiden, are of a superior order. Like the angels of Heaven they seem to be spirits of original creation, never having had a physical existence. Only two others are specifically named, Angelo, a spirit from Earth, and Ianthe, a spirit coming presumably from one of the numerous worlds to which Nesace and her followers are commanded to bear the secrets of Heaven.⁴² Among the "thousand seraphs"—which may mean many

⁴¹*Al Aaraaf*, I, 141-150.

⁴²Most scholars, I believe, differ with me on this point. Professor Campbell says, in his note to II, 178: "Ianthe, apparently, was native to Al Aaraaf." *Poe's Poems*, p. 190.

thousands—there are doubtless spirits whose material existences belonged to widely different worlds;⁴³ yet they all, like Angelo, arrive on Al Aaraaf through the common gateway of death,⁴⁴ and belong, like him, to an order inferior to Nesace and Ligeia.

In addition to these higher intelligences, there exist also on Al Aaraaf such immaterial things as fairy flowers and the spiritual essences of objects that have their material existence elsewhere. We find there, for example, a fairy flower that drives bees mad, the

gemmy flower, of Trebizond misnam'd—
Inmate of highest stars, where erst it sham'd
All other loveliness;⁴⁵

there, also, is

that aspiring flower that sprang on Earth—
And died, ere scarce exalted into birth,
Bursting its odorous heart in spirit to wing
Its way to Heaven, from garden of a king.⁴⁶

These and other "fair flowers and fairy" have the function of bearing Nesace's song in odors up to Heaven.⁴⁷ Nesace's palace itself, with its "dome by linked light from Heaven let down,"⁴⁸ seems rather a spiritual emanation than a material edifice.⁴⁹ About its pillars and cornices seraphs have seen

The dimness of this world: that greyish green
That Nature loves the best for Beauty's grave.⁵⁰

⁴³In *Eureka* (1848), he calls mankind "a member of the cosmical family of Intelligences." *Poe's Works*, XVI, p. 187. See also *Mesmeric Revelation* (1844), *ibid.*, V, p. 252.

⁴⁴*Al Aaraaf*, II, 156–161.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, I, 50–52.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, I, 70–73.

⁴⁷*Al Aaraaf*, I, 42–81.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, II, 20.

⁴⁹Professor Campbell compares it to Pandemonium in *Paradise Lost*. See *Poe's Poems*, p. 182.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, II, 29–30.

Its friezes and sculptured cherubs, which still seem earthly when obscured by shadows, have been transported there in spirit from such treasuries of ancient art as Tadmor, Persepolis, Balbec, and Gomorrah.⁵¹

The name of Poe's spirit world is identical, except in spelling, with that of the Mohammedan purgatory, *al Arâf*, but the two places have little else in common. In many respects the one is the exact antithesis of the other. Concerning *al Arâf* the Koran says in Chapter VII, entitled *Al Arâf*:

And between the blessed and the damned there shall be a veil; and men shall stand on *al Arâf*, who shall know every one of them by their marks; and shall call unto the inhabitants of paradise, saying, Peace be upon you: yet they shall not enter therein, although they earnestly desire it. And when they shall turn their eyes towards the companions of hell fire, they shall say, O Lord, place us not with the ungodly people!

This passage will be more easily understood if we quote a part of Sale's commentary:

Before we proceed to a description of the *Mohammedan* paradise, we must not forget to say something of the wall or partition which they imagine to be between that place and hell, and seems to be copied from the great gulph of separation mentioned in scripture [Luke, xvi, 26]. They call it *al Orf*, and more frequently in the plural, *al Arâf*, a word derived from the verb *arafa*, which signifies to *distinguish* between things, or to *part* them; tho' some commentators give another reason for the imposition of this name, because, say they, those who stand on this partition, will *know* and *distinguish* the blessed from the damned, by their respective marks or characteristics: and others say the word properly intends any thing that is *high raised* or *elevated*, as such a wall or separation must be supposed to be. The *Mohammedan* writers greatly differ as to the persons who are to be found on *al Arâf*. Some imagine it to be a sort of *limbo*, for the patriarchs and prophets, or for the martyrs and those who have been most eminent for sanctity, among whom they say there

⁵¹It is said, as Poe tells us in a note, that the remains of Gomorrah and other cities engulfed by the waters of the Dead Sea "may be discovered by looking down into the transparent lake." In a letter to John Neal (December, 1829) regarding *Al Aaraaf*, Poe explains that he has "supposed many of the lost sculptures of our world to have flown (in spirit) to the star 'Al Aaraaf'—a delicate place more suited to their divinity." See Woodberry's *Poe*, I, p. 59.

will be also angels in the form of men. Others place here such whose good and evil works are so equal that they exactly counterpoise each other, and therefore deserve neither reward nor punishment; and these they say, will on the last day be admitted into paradise, after they shall have performed an act of adoration, which will be imputed to them as a merit, and will make the scale of their good works to overbalance. Others suppose this intermediate space will be a receptacle for those who have gone to war, without their parents' leave, and therein suffered martyrdom; being excluded paradise for their disobedience, and escaping hell because they are martyrs."⁵²

The differences between the Mohammedan al Arâf and Poe's Al Aaraaf may be summarized thus:

1. Al Arâf is a wall permanently fixed to separate Hell from Heaven; Al Aaraaf is a star free to wander at God's direction throughout the universe.

2. Al Arâf affords a view of both Heaven and Hell, and its inhabitants are able to distinguish both the good and the evil by their respective marks; Al Aaraaf cannot approach Heaven, and is remote from Hell, and its inhabitants know nothing of good and evil, being non-moral.

3. Al Arâf, according to Sale, is a sort of purgatory,⁵³ and according to the Koran, its inhabitants desire to enter Heaven but may not; Al Aaraaf is a place of happiness, and its inhabitants are content.

Of the wandering habits of Al Aaraaf enough has been said already. The second and third points of difference, however, the happiness of the spirits of Al Aaraaf and their ignorance of good and evil, require further discussion.

Happiness on Al Aaraaf is not the high felicity of Paradise, but a pleasurable contentment. It is like the sensuous luxuriance one might find on Earth

In dreamy gardens, where do lie
Dreamy maidens all the day.⁵⁴

Nesace is the happiest creature on Al Aaraaf,⁵⁵ but Ligeia is the most joyous.⁵⁶ At its present anchorage the star is

⁵²Sale, George: The Koran, London, 1734; *Preliminary Discourse*, Sec. IV, pp. 94-95.

⁵³He specifically calls it a purgatory in his note to Chap. VII.

⁵⁴*Al Aaraaf*, I, 12-13 (1831 version).

⁵⁵*Al Aaraaf*, I, 30.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, II, 104-110.

rolling in seas of splendor,⁵⁷ wherein even the flowers are happy.⁵⁸ The inferior spirits, though less happy, yet find contentment in dreams of beauty and in the milder delights of love.⁵⁹ Professor Woodberry has said that they "choose, instead of that tranquility which makes the highest bliss, the sharper delights of love, wine, and pleasing melancholy, at the price of annihilation in the moment of their extremest joy."⁶⁰ It seems to me, however, that they choose it for its beauty, and that it is precisely the sharper delights, or passions, which are forbidden them, as the story of Angelo and Ianthe is intended to emphasize.⁶¹ But if their delights are mild, so are their pains. Their griefs are so softened that they seem almost pleasurable—

Joy's voice so peacefully departed
That, like the murmur in the shell
Its echo dwelleth and will dwell.⁶²

As Poe explains it in a note:

Sorrow is not excluded from "Al Aaraaf," but it is that sorrow which the living love to cherish for the dead, and which, in some minds, resembles the delirium of opium. The passionate excitement of Love and the buoyancy of spirit attendant upon intoxication are its less holy pleasures—the price of which, to those souls who make choice of 'Al Aaraaf' as their residence after life, is final death and annihilation.⁶³

Such happiness as the spirits of Al Aaraaf possess is possible only because they have no knowledge of good and evil, for such knowledge, as I have shown,⁶⁴ is disastrous to all

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, I, 20–21.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, II, 60–61.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, II, 72–89.

⁶⁰*Life of Poe*, I, 61–62.

⁶¹Passion belongs to the comets, or fallen angels, of Hell; it is the "red fire of their heart," which drives them ceaselessly. See *Al Aaraaf*, I, 91–97.

⁶²*Al Aaraaf*, I, 8–10.

⁶³*Poe's Poems*, p. 190. Poe's note to II, 173. The part of the note here quoted refers, I think, to Poe's star Al Aaraaf, not to the al Arâf of the Arabians, which is mentioned earlier in the same note, as Professor Woodberry seems to take it.

⁶⁴See above, p. 114.

except the angels of Heaven, whose knowledge is perfect. Thus Nesace's followers are

Seraphs in all but "Knowledge," the keen light
That fell, refracted, thro' thy bounds, afar,
O Death! from eye of God upon that star:
Sweet was that error—sweeter still that death—
Sweet was that error—ev'n with us the breath
Of Science dims the mirror of our joy—
To them 'twere the Simoom, and would destroy.⁶⁵

Knowledge, then, is the pure light from Heaven, which it is the aim of science to understand. But its dazzling brightness cannot be reflected in mere human minds, which are clouded by the protective atmosphere of material nature. When this protective atmosphere is removed by death, the mind is unable to bear the light unless purified itself by the Divine Truth which produced it. Its pure white ray is refracted as it passes through death into the atmosphere of Al Aaraaf, which is apparently denser than that of Earth, and is there dispersed in its component colors. The "error" is the error of refraction, and it is sweet because it creates on Al Aaraaf a soothing influence that makes life there an unintellectual and unemotional state of dream. Hence, the spirits of this star know nothing of good and evil; they neither desire Heaven nor fear Hell, but find complete satisfaction in the tranquil pleasures of dreams and fantasies. With the intellect and the passions they properly have nothing to do.

Beyond that death no immortality—
But sleep that pondereth and is not "to be"—
And there—oh! may my weary spirit dwell—
Apart from Heaven's Eternity—and yet how far
from Hell!⁶⁶

"To be" here implies "to think"; hence there can be no immortality without intellectual activity. To ponder, on the other hand, as Poe uses the word, is to engage in reverie or day-dreaming,⁶⁷ which is an activity of the imagination

⁶⁵*Al Aaraaf*, II, 159-165.

⁶⁶*Al Aaraaf*, II, 170-173.

⁶⁷See *ibid.*, II, 72-75.

rather than of the intellect. Thus the spirits of Al Aaraaf may be said to have no immortality.

Not even in Al Aaraaf, however, is the spirit exempt from duty. Nesace, as we have seen, calls upon her subject spirits to aid her in carrying God's messages to all parts of the universe. They do not themselves reflect, but obey Nesace's commands, or else suffer just punishment; to quote Ianthe's phrase—

not to us
Be given our lady's bidding to discuss.⁶⁸

Not even love can excuse disobedience,

for Heaven no grace imparts
To those who hear not for their beating hearts.⁶⁹

The fate of Ianthe and Angelo is the fate of all on Al Aaraaf who fail in the performance of their duty. This does not mean that love is wholly forbidden, but it must not interfere with duty, as it probably will if it is passionate.

O! where (and ye may seek the wide skies over)
Was Love, the blind, near sober Duty known?
Unguided Love hath fallen.⁷⁰

Thought alone can make us partners of God's throne,⁷¹ but we may approach it through beauty sufficiently near to find in the effluence of divinity the fulfilment of our soul's highest aspirations. In Poe's earliest poems we find evidence of this conception of beauty as a means, independent of thought, by which we may communicate with God. In *Stanzas* (1827) he speaks of a "wild light" that had strange power over his spirit; it was perhaps the "unembodied essence" of thought, given in beauty to those whose passion would otherwise draw them down to Hell. Beauty, or the love of beauty, is consequently of especial value to those in whom the reasoning faculty is weak, because it is a bar to the degrading pull of the passions. Contrary to the general

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, II, 245-246.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, II, 176-177.

⁷⁰*Al Aaraaf*, II, 179-181.

⁷¹*Ibid.*, I, 110-113.

opinion, however, Poe did not set beauty above truth, but wished to demonstrate that each in its own way draws us toward God, the one exalting the soul, the other strengthening the mind. Al Aaraaf, the birthplace of the Idea of Beauty,⁷² is reserved for the spiritual abode of all lovers of beauty, apart from the enthusiasm of Heaven, yet safe from the misery of Hell.

III

Of the more recent interpretations of *Al Aaraaf* the fullest is that of Professor W. B. Cairns.⁷³ He agrees with Professor Woodberry and others in finding in the poem the doctrine that through devotion to the higher beauty one may avoid sin, which, being a passion or the fruit of passion, is antagonistic to beauty. He also points out the fact that both knowledge and passion are denied to the spirits of Al Aaraaf. But his most interesting suggestion is that "the idea of beauty indefinitely bodied forth in 'Al Aaraaf' seems to foreshadow the critical theory of poetry" later formulated by Poe. He thinks, however, that such foreshadowing was not consciously planned. "That 'Al Aaraaf' was intended as a presentation of Poe's view of poetry," he concludes, "or that he had consciously formulated his critical theories in 1829, is hardly to be believed."

It is my own opinion, notwithstanding the difficulty of establishing it, that *Al Aaraaf* was written by Poe with the conscious purpose of presenting allegorically his theory of poetry, and that this theory, as then conceived, was substantially the same as later enunciated. The development of this purpose, with its aesthetic motif, constitutes the third structural element of the poem.

Poe was himself by no means averse to the use of an undercurrent of allegory, though he was strongly opposed to pure allegory, and went so far as to remark in one of his

⁷²*Al Aaraaf*, I, 31.

⁷³"Some Notes on Poe's 'Al Aaraaf,'" *Modern Philology*, XIII, 35-44 (May, 1915).

essays that "all allegories are contemptible";⁷⁴ he was provoked to the statement, however, by a poor example of allegorical writing. He read with much interest and partial approval the *Kunstromane*, or Art Novels, of Germany,⁷⁵ which, he explains, are

books written not so much in immediate defence, or in illustration, as in personification of individual portions of the Fine Arts—books which, in the guise of Romance, labor to the sole end of reasoning men into admiration and study of the beautiful, by a tissue of *bizarre* fiction, partly allegorical, and partly metaphysical. In Germany alone could so mad—or perhaps so profound—an idea have originated.⁷⁶

His own *Al Aaraaf* is something like a personification of his theory of art; that is, it is pictorial rather than expository. As allegory it is impressionistic, not formal. All of his allegorical poems and tales—and most of the poems are allegorical to some extent—are of the impressionistic type with a few exceptions, such as *The Conqueror Worm* and *William Wilson*.

Such allegories are of necessity indefinite, and their indefiniteness illustrates a theory that was early formulated and invariably adhered to by Poe throughout his career; namely, that the poem, unlike the romance, has "for its object an *indefinite* instead of a *definite* pleasure."⁷⁷ This theory does not require, of course, that the poem be incoherent or obscure, but an unskillful artist may by attempting to follow it produce an obscure poem. That, apparently, is what happened in the case of *Al Aaraaf*.

In one of his later critical essays Poe has said that all that we can understand or feel to be poetic has grown out of

⁷⁴Review of H. B. Hirst's poems (*Broadway Journal*, July 12, 1845), *Poe's Works*, XII, p. 174.

⁷⁵Carlyle says Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* is the earliest *Kunstroman*, and is considered by the Germans "greatly the first in excellence." *Carlyle's Works*, Edinburgh Edition, XXI, p. 4.

⁷⁶From the review of H. F. Chorley's *Conti the Discarded* (*Southern Literary Messenger*, February, 1836), *Poe's Works*, VIII, p. 231.

⁷⁷*Letter to B*—— (originally the preface to the volume of 1831), reprinted in *Poe's Poems*, pp. 317–318.

the struggle of the soul "to apprehend the supernal Loveliness."⁷⁸ This desire to apprehend supernal beauty he calls the poetic sentiment, and its expression is poetry. As thus used, the term "poetry," including painting, sculpture, architecture, and music as well as the poetry of words, is equivalent to the term "art," and Poe has often employed it in this general sense.

It is no mere appreciation of the Beauty before us—but a wild effort to reach the Beauty above. Inspired by an ecstatic prescience of the glories beyond the grave, we struggle, by multiform combinations among the things and thoughts of Time, to attain a portion of that Loveliness whose very elements perhaps, appertain to eternity alone.⁷⁹

The poet, then, is an inspired artist who seeks to reproduce in Earthly forms the Heavenly beauty revealed to him in visions. By the poet's reproductions, others are led to a contemplation of the beautiful, in which, Poe says, is found that elevation of soul—not of intellect or of heart—from which is derived the purest and most intense pleasure.⁸⁰ The soul is elevated, or excited, in being made to harmonize more perfectly with divine beauty; hence poets become the means of drawing men closer to God.

Poe declared beauty to be the sole province of the poem;⁸¹ that is, of art. In our allegory, the star Al Aaraaf is the realm of beauty, and the spirits who dwell there are artists, lovers of beauty, whose duty it is to reveal to men the true nature of God. Nesace is the personification of beauty itself, while Ligeia is the personification of harmony, which is the quality of beauty that induces or stimulates in the artist the poetic sentiment. So it is that through Ligeia, Nesace arouses the spirits of Al Aaraaf to a sense of their duty, and urges them to the performance of it. In conventional poetry the Muse bears the same relation to the poet

⁷⁸*The Poetic Principle, Poe's Works, XIV, p. 274.*

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, XIV, pp. 273-274.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, XIV, p. 275.

⁸¹*The Philosophy of Composition, Poe's Works, XIV, p. 198.* Most of Poe's principles of criticism may be found in several different places and in varying forms among his critical essays.

as Nesace bears to her subjects. The divine harmony, which Poe calls beauty, but which others have named truth, descends from God to men not in its original purity, but as made intelligible to terrestrial senses in perceptible forms of beauty, just as the absolute silence of God's voice is first translated into the material silence of Nesace's spiritual song, and then further translated into the audible music of Ligeia.⁸²

God can be apprehended in only two ways: intellectually, by process of reason, and spiritually, by ecstasy or exaltation of soul. The former is closed to man because his knowledge is yet imperfect. By the latter, therefore, that is, through feeling instead of thought, he must correct his misconceptions of God.⁸³ The poet arranges the forms of terrestrial beauty in a semblance of the celestial pattern, in the contemplation of which man's soul is exalted to ecstasy and made one with the divine. Thus the poets, like the spirits of *Al Aaraaf*, are the messengers chosen of God to divulge the secrets of Heaven.

Nesace, who, it will be remembered, receives her commission from God by communication of thought, transfers it in music to her followers. But communication to men must be by other means, and that means is fantasy, or the imagination. As Nesace says,

By winged Fantasy,
My embassy is given,
Till secrecy shall knowledge be
In the environs of Heaven.⁸⁴

Reason sees the pure white light of truth; fantasy sees the same light after it has been broken up into its component colors, that is, after refraction. On *Al Aaraaf*, it will be observed, the dominant colors are purple, opal, and gold—never pure white, except in the lily, where other symbolic values intrude. The philosopher is concerned with the pure ray, the artist with the component colors; and whereas the

⁸²See *Al Aaraaf*, I, 124 ff., II, 64 ff., and II, 144 ff.

⁸³See above, p. 114.

⁸⁴*Al Aaraaf*, I, 114–117.

instrument of the one is reason, the instrument of the other is imagination. Images are created in the mind, then by the technical skill of the artist *personified* in forms of beauty.⁸⁵ "Imagination is, possibly in man," says Poe, "a lesser degree of the creative power in God. What the Deity imagines *is*, but *was not* before. What man imagines, *is*, but *was* also. The mind of man cannot imagine what *is not*."⁸⁶ It is, in fact, a kind of "chemistry of the intellect," its "sole object and inevitable test" being the fabrication of beauty.⁸⁷ Poe identified the human instinct of veneration with the faculty of ideality, which, in turn, he defined as the sentiment of poesy. "This sentiment is the sense of the beautiful, of the sublime, and of the mystical. . . . Imagination is its soul."⁸⁸

But this faculty of ideality, this sense of the beautiful, has nothing to do with the passions of mankind.⁸⁹ Even love, if it is passionate, hinders the poet in his devotion to beauty. Nesace, on this account, calls upon her spirits to forego love for duty:

And true love caresses—
O! leave them apart:
They are light on the tresses,
But lead on the heart.⁹⁰

⁸⁵Every one is familiar with Poe's definition of the poetry of words as "the rhythmical creation of beauty." In a review of Griswold's *Poets and Poetry of America* (*Philadelphia Saturday Museum*, 1843) he comments thus upon this definition: "Poetry . . . may be more properly defined as *the rhythmical personification of existing or real beauty*. One defines it as the 'rhythmical creation of beauty'; but though it certainly is a 'creation of beauty' in itself, it is more properly a personification, for the poet only personifies the image previously created by his mind." *Poe's Works*, XI, pp. 225-226.

⁸⁶Review of the poems of Drake and Halleck (*Southern Literary Messenger*, April, 1836), *Poe's Works*, VIII, p. 283, note 2.

⁸⁷Review of N. P. Willis (*Broadway Journal*, January 18, 1845), *Poe's Works*, XII, pp. 38-39.

⁸⁸Review of the poems of Drake and Halleck, *loc. cit.*, VIII, pp. 282-283.

⁸⁹*Ibid.*, p. 283.

⁹⁰*Al Aaraaf*, II, 96-99.

The story of Angelo and Ianthe is an illustration of how the passion of love may cause the ruin of artists by distracting them from their proper work, the creation and dissemination of beauty.

They fell: for Heaven to them no hope imparts
Who hear not for the beating of their hearts.⁹¹

The artist who, for whatever reason, perverts his art by devoting it to the delineation of passion instead of beauty will "fall"; that is, he will cease to be a true artist. If passion is to be made the subject of poetry, it must be softened, for otherwise it is best suited to prose:

True passion is prosaic—homely. Any strong mental emotion stimulates *all* the mental faculties; thus grief the imagination:—but in proportion as the effect is strengthened, the cause surceases. The excited fancy triumphs—the grief is subdued—chastened,—is no longer grief. In this mood we are poetic, and it is clear that a poem now written will be poetic in the exact ratio of its dispassion. A passionate poem is a contradiction in terms.⁹²

The sorrow of Al Aaraaf is precisely that softened grief "which the living love to cherish for the dead" that is here described as poetic.⁹³ Sometimes a writer, as Tennyson in *Locksley Hall*, brings to the aid of passion the "terseness and pungency which are derivable from rhythm and from rhyme." But the effect produced is passionate, that of a "magnificent philippic," not poetic. The same poet's *Oenone*, on the other hand, exalts the soul to a conception of pure beauty, which "as far transcends earthly passion as the holy radiance of the sun does the glimmering and feeble phosphorescence of the glowworm." Poe admits that the majority of mankind are perhaps "more susceptible of the impulses of passion than of the impressions of beauty"; nevertheless he believes the sentiment of the beautiful to be a "divine sixth sense" which is yet little understood.⁹⁴

⁹¹*Ibid.*, II, 263–264.

⁹²*Marginalia II*, from the *Democratic Review*, December, 1844, *Poe's Works*, XVI, p. 56.

⁹³See the quotation on p. 120 above.

⁹⁴Review of R. H. Horne's *Orion* (*Graham's Magazine*, March, 1844), *Poe's Works*, XI, p. 255.

This sixth sense brings intimations of divine Love, transcending all human love, and especially passionate love, which is suited to the highest poetry. It is perhaps this divine Love without which the spirits of Al Aaraaf could not be happy—

O, how, without you, Love!
Could angels be blest?⁹⁵

The distinction between passionate love and divine Love is clearly made by Poe in his essay on *The Poetic Principle*:

It has been my purpose to suggest that, while this Principle itself is, strictly and simply, the Human Aspiration for Supernal Beauty, the manifestation of the Principle is always found in *an elevating excitement of the Soul*, quite independent of that passion which is the intoxication of the Heart, or of that Truth which is the satisfaction of the Reason. For, in regard to Passion, alas! its tendency is to degrade rather than elevate the Soul. Love, on the contrary—Love, the true, the divine Eros, the Uranian, as distinguished from the Dionaeian Venus—is unquestionably the purest and truest of all poetical themes.⁹⁶

Divine Love exalts the soul because it is akin to the instinct of veneration and the faculty of ideality, which Poe identified with the sentiment of poesy. It is this Uranian Eros who in Israfel's heaven is a "grown-up God."⁹⁷

The sonnet *To Science*, which was intended as a proem to *Al Aaraaf*, condemns science for destroying the world of romance and imagination.

Hast thou not dragged Diana from her car,
And driven the Hamadryad from the wood
To seek a shelter in some happier star?
Hast thou not torn the Naiad from her flood,
The Elfin from the green grass, and from me
The summer dream beneath the tamarind tree?⁹⁸

⁹⁵*Al Aaraaf*, II, 88–89.

⁹⁶*The Poetic Principle*, *Poe's Works*, XIV, p. 290.

⁹⁷See *Israfel*, line 25.

⁹⁸Lines 9–14. In the mention of the tamarind tree, and in the "sleep that pondereth and is not 'to be,'" there is a suggestion of the Buddhist Nirvana, where the soul is released from karma.

Al Aaraaf is doubtless the happier star, where, in place of the summer dream, we have the "sleep that pondereth and is not 'to be.'"⁹⁹ Science, the enemy of the poetic sentiment, would destroy these dreaming spirits of Al Aaraaf—

To them 'twere the Simoom, and would destroy—
For what (to them) availeth it to know
That Truth is Falsehood—or that Bliss is Woe?¹⁰⁰

It would destroy them by dissipating their illusions, the product of imagination, by which their existence is made calm and happy. In his critical essays Poe often assumes truth to be identical with knowledge and science as here used, opposing it to beauty and imagination. In this sense truth is inimical to art because it destroys the artist's illusions, thereby impairing his imagination and upsetting his values.

It is not the function of art, therefore, to give instruction. If the artist must concern himself with morality, it should be only through suggestion. In a review of Lowell's poems, he complains of the "error of *didacticism*" in the *Legend of Brittany*. "The story," he adds, "might have been rendered more *unique*, and altogether more in consonance with the true poetic sentiment, by suffering the morality to be *suggested*."¹⁰¹ Elsewhere he says that "didactic subjects are utterly *beyond*, or rather beneath, the province of true poesy."¹⁰² But truth may be properly employed to arouse the poetic sentiment; Coleridge, for example, wished in the *Ancient Mariner* "to infuse the *Poetic Sentiment* through

⁹⁹See p. 121 above.

¹⁰⁰*Al Aaraaf*, II, 162-165.

¹⁰¹In *Graham's Magazine*, March, 1844. *Poe's Works*, XI, p. 247.

¹⁰²In his review of *Twice-Told Tales* (*Graham's Magazine*, May, 1842) Poe makes the point that prose is a more suitable medium for the inculcation of truth than is poetry. "In fact, while the *rhythm* of this latter is an essential aid in the development of the poet's highest idea—the idea of the Beautiful—the artificialities of this rhythm are an inseparable bar to the development of all points of thought or expression which have their basis in Truth. (*Poe's Works*, XI, p. 108.)

channels suggested by mental analysis."¹⁰³ Knowledge (truth as above defined) leads to death,¹⁰⁴ and it is the artist's duty to save man by leading him "gently back to Beauty, to Nature, and to Life." After the destruction of the world, this fact will be known. In the *Colloquy of Monos and Una* one of the characters says:

Occasionally the poetic intellect—that intellect which we now feel to have been the most exalted of all—since those truths which to us were of the most enduring importance could only be reached by that *analogy* which speaks in proof-tones to the imagination alone, and to the unaided reason bears no weight—occasionally did this poetic intellect proceed a step farther in the evolving of the vague idea of the philosophic, and find in the mystic parable that tells of the tree of knowledge, and of its forbidden fruit, death-producing, a distinct intimation that knowledge was not meet for man in the infant condition of his soul.¹⁰⁵

Here Poe is making an important distinction between the truth that is reached through reason and the truth that is attained by imagination. The former is conformity to the reality of Earth, the latter is conformity to the reality of Heaven, and hence supernal, ideal.

Imagination, by which this divine truth is revealed, is the soul or active principle of the sentiment of poesy, or sense of the beautiful.¹⁰⁶ It is a more certain means to truth than reason.

Truth is, in its own essence, sublime—but her loftiest sublimity, as derived from man's clouded and erratic reason, is valueless—is pulseless—is utterly ineffective when brought into comparison with the unerring *sense* of which we speak.¹⁰⁷

Poe goes so far as to express the belief that "all *very* profound knowledge" originates in a highly stimulated

¹⁰³Review of *The Book of Gems* (*Southern Literary Messenger*, August, 1836), *Poe's Works*, IX, p. 95. See also the discussion of poetic effect through the harmony of truth in *The Poetic Principle*, *Poe's Works*, XIV, p. 290.

¹⁰⁴See p. 114 above.

¹⁰⁵*Poe's Works*, III, p. 202.

¹⁰⁶See p. 127 above.

¹⁰⁷Review of R. H. Horne's *Orion*, *loc. cit.*, *Poe's Works*, XI, p. 257.

imagination.¹⁰⁸ At its highest, the imagination becomes a function of the soul. Kepler "guessed" the laws from which Newton deduced the fact of gravitation; that is, "he *imagined* them," grasped them with his soul "through mere dint of intuition."¹⁰⁹ But it is in the artist that imagination is strongest; his glimpses of the supernal are clearest, and his knowledge of the great secrets is most profound. Through him chiefly must be revealed the divine truths now hidden from man and beyond the power of reason ever to attain. Yet this benefactor of the human race is little esteemed.

When *shall* the artist assume his proper situation in society? . . . How long shall the veriest vermin of the Earth, who crawl around the altar of Mammon, be more esteemed of men than they, the gifted ministers to those exalted emotions which link us with the mysteries of Heaven?¹¹⁰

His answer is, "Not long." The poem *Al Aaraaf*, written several years before the words just quoted, was, I am convinced, an attempt to improve the status of the artist in the opinion of the world.

No argument is necessary to establish the fact that the poem exalts beauty, or that, in keeping with the sonnet, "To Science," originally printed as a head-piece, it condemns knowledge, or science. Does it thereby condemn truth? I think not; for Poe had in mind precisely that ideal truth, the truth of Heaven rather than the truth of Earth, which, as we have just seen, he later associated with poetry and imagination. This divine truth he identified with supernal beauty. He offered *Eureka*, as he explains in the preface, to those who feel, not think; "not in its character of Truth-Teller, but for the Beauty that abounds in its Truth, constituting it true." In the poem itself—for he calls it a poem, an "Art-Product"—he asserts that "a perfect consistency can be nothing but an absolute truth."¹¹¹ Of the

¹⁰⁸*Fifty Suggestions*, Poe's Works, XIV, p. 187.

¹⁰⁹*Eureka*, Poe's Works, XVI, pp. 196-197.

¹¹⁰Review of Chorley's *Conti the Discarded*, loc. cit., Poe's Works, VIII, p. 230.

¹¹¹*Eureka*, Poe's Works, XVI, p. 196.

Nebular Theory of Laplace, for example, he says, "It is by far too beautiful, indeed, *not* to possess Truth as its essentiality."¹¹² Symmetry he calls "the poetical essence of the Universe"; but "symmetry and consistency are convertible terms:—thus Poetry and Truth are one." Hence the conclusion: "Man cannot long or widely err, if he suffer himself to be guided by his poetical, which I have maintained to be his truthful, in being his symmetrical, instinct."¹¹³

Thus the spirits of Al Aaraaf, the artists of our human world, reveal through beauty the truth of Heaven. When this truth shall become known—when

secrecy shall knowledge be
In the environs of Heaven—

then man may rise in thought towards God and become a partner of His throne.¹¹⁴

If this study has made Poe's *Al Aaraaf* more intelligible, my main purpose is accomplished. I should like to think, however, that it has also helped to give significance to a poem often unappreciated. By way of conclusion, I should like to bring two suggestions to the attention of students of Poe. In the first place, I believe we misjudge Poe when we class him as a worshipper of beauty for its own sake. On the contrary, he loved beauty as a revealer of truth beyond the scope of reason. In the second place, I wish to point out what I hope has already become evident; namely, that Poe developed his theory of poetry at the very beginning of his career, and that to the end of his life it remained substantially as originally conceived.

¹¹²*Eureka*, Poe's *Works*, XVI, p. 252.

¹¹³*Ibid.*, p. 302.

¹¹⁴See *Al Aaraaf*, I, 110–117.

WHITMAN AND HEGEL

BY MODY C. BOATRIGHT

Whitman's numerous references to Hegel¹ invite an inquiry into the extent of the German philosopher's influence on the American poet. The question is significant not only in relation to Whitman, but also in relation to the larger question of German influence on the Transcendental Movement in American thought and literature.

Without doubt, something of German influence reached Whitman through Emerson, who seems to have been his chief inspirer. There is evidence, however, that Whitman made some effort to master Hegel on his own account, and however fragmentary the success, the results of this effort are plainly discernible in *Leaves of Grass*.

Whitman was in no technical sense a philosopher, but he did look at life from one habitual point of view, and this point of view, in the main, is in accord with the Absolute Idealism of Hegel.

Whitman's universe, like Hegel's, is not a fixed and finished order. It is in eternal process of becoming. From the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* to *Old Age Echoes*, the fluid-like state of the universe is one of his constantly recurring themes. In *Starting from Paumanok* (1855) he looks about him with delight and exclaims,

This then is life,
Here is what has come to the surface after so many
throes and convulsions.²

¹For examples see *The Base of all Metaphysics*, p. 101; *Roaming in Thought*, p. 233; *Prose Works*, I, pp. 311 ff.; II, pp. 119 ff., pp. 135-36; VI, pp. 120 ff.; 168 ff.

Throughout this paper references to the poems are to the "Inclusive Edition," edited by Emory Holloway, Garden City, 1927. The first number represents the page, the number or numbers immediately following the colon, the line or lines. If there are two numbers preceding the colon, the second represents the section or stanza.

References to the prose works are to the "Camden Edition," edited by R. M. Bucke, T. B. Harned, and H. L. Traubel, New York and London, 1902.

²*Starting from Paumanok*, 12, 2: 4-5.

And at seventy-eight he wrote,

A breath of Deity, as thence the bulging universe
unfolding;
The many issuing cycles from their precedent minute!
The eras of the soul incepting in an hour,
Haply the widest, farthest evolutions of the world and
man.³

In *I Sing the Body Electric*, he observes,

All is a procession,
The universe is a procession with measured and perfect
motion.⁴

But more frequent in Whitman's poetry, and more expressive of his conception, is the metaphor of the "float," an excellent epithet for that primal stuff that continually differentiates itself into the particular and the individual.

I too had been struck from the float forever held in
solution,
I too had receiv'd identity by my body.⁵
I too have bubbled up, floated the measureless float,
and been washed on your shores.⁶

The universe, then, is in constant flux, but there is order in its apparent chaos. All change comes as a result of orderly development, the seeds of the future being contained in the past. "Every condition," Whitman declares, "promulges not only itself, it promulges what grows after and out of itself."⁷ Again, he writes:

For what is the present after all but growth out of the
past,
As a projectile form'd, impell'd, passing a certain line
still keeps on,
So the present, utterly formed, impell'd by the past.⁸

The constant ebb and flow of the universe is not to Whitman any more than to Hegel the aimless activity seen by

³*A Thought of Columbus*, 463, 11: 3-6.

⁴*I Sing the Body Electric*, 83, 6: 15-16.

⁵*Crossing Brooklyn Ferry*, 136, 5: 9-10.

⁶*As I Ebb'd with the Ocean of Life*, 217, 3: 18.

⁷*Song of Myself*, 69, 45: 12-13.

⁸*Passage to India*, 343, 1: 13-15.

Schopenhauer and Thomas Hardy. "It is form, union, plan—it is eternal life."⁹

Do you suppose I have some intricate purpose?

Well I have, for the Fourth-month showers have, and
the mica on the side of the rock has.¹⁰

The vapors rise and move away to distant continents "for reasons,"¹¹ and the "orbs and the systems of orbs play their swift sports through the air on purpose."¹² A little more specific are the statements in *Song of the Rolling Earth*.¹³ In that poem, Whitman takes the earth as a symbol of the universal. Among other things it stands for progress, "amelioration." So throughout the poetry of Walt Whitman, the present is implicit in the past, and the future is implicit in the present. Progress is usually defined in terms of the individual: each one is the end of the cosmic evolutionary process.

I am the acme of things accomplished, and I am an
encloser of things to be.¹⁴

So, too, is the body of a slave.

For it the globe lay preparing quintillions of years
without one animal or plant,
For it the revolving cycles truly and steadily roll'd.¹⁵

Whitman attempted to reconcile the contradictions of life by thinking of the universe as a vast organism exhibiting at once the greatest possible unity and the greatest conceivable diversity. In the poems this idea has its most direct expression in *On the Beach at Night Alone*, first published in 1856.¹⁶

⁹*Song of Myself*, 75, 50: 10.

¹⁰*Song of Myself*, 39, 19: 11-12.

¹¹*Salut au Monde*, 122, 13:4.

¹²*Assurances*, 373, 1: 5.

¹³*Song of the Rolling Earth*, 187.

¹⁴*Song of Myself*, 68, 44: 15.

¹⁵*I Sing the Body Electric*, 84, 7: 6-7.

¹⁶221-222.

A vast similitude interlocks all,
 All spheres, grown, ungrown, small, large, suns, moons,
 planets,
 All distances of place however wide,
 All distances of time, all inanimate forms,
 All souls, all living bodies though they be ever so
 different, or in different worlds,
 All gaseous, watery, vegetable, mineral processes, the
 fishes, the brutes,
 All nations, colors, barbarisms, civilizations, languages,
 All identities that have existed or may exist on this globe,
 or any globe,
 All lives and deaths, all of the past, present, future,
 This vast similitude spans them, and always has spann'd,
 And shall forever span them and compactly hold and
 enclose them.

Like Hegel, Whitman found the universe to be one. Like Hegel again, he found it in its final reality to be thought. The so-called material is in its last analysis spiritual. "I will make poems of materials," he announces, "for I think they are to be the most spiritual poems."¹⁷ He continues,

I will not make a poem nor the least part of a poem
 but has reference to the soul,
 Because having look'd at the objects of the universe,
 I find there is no one nor any particle of one but
 has reference to the soul.¹⁸

Again, the earth has something of the character of a mirror: to the perfect soul it is perfect; to the soul that is jagged and broken, it is jagged and broken.¹⁹

This does not mean, as will be apparent later, that Whitman in order to reconcile the contradictions of life reduced the external world to a mere phantom of the subjective life. He must have had in mind some sort of primal stuff of which both mind, as we know it introspectively, and nature are made.

Whitman is fond of asserting the identity of opposites.

¹⁷*Starting from Paumanok*, 14, 6:3.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 19, 12: 20-21.

¹⁹*Song of the Rolling Earth*, 186.

It is in connection with these denials of dualism that he is most interesting. When he makes such assertions as

I am the poet of the Body, and I am the poet of the Soul,²⁰

or asks,

If the body does not do fully as much for the soul?
And if the body were not the soul, what is the soul?²¹

he is insisting upon the importance of body in personality. Personality he thinks of as "a curious trio," consisting of "I," "my body," and "my soul."²² Here is the Hegelian triad: soul, thesis; body, antithesis; "I," synthesis. This is the "I" of the *Song of Myself*, for which there is no name in the dictionary.²³

Whitman identifies, or in some way merges, good and evil.²⁴ Such a mergence seems a logical necessity to Absolute Idealism. For if the Absolute is to be absolute, it must prove itself capable of reconciling all contradiction whatever. It must in some way take into self what from a lower category are opposites: the rational and the irrational. McTaggart²⁵ believes that Hegel had no definite solution for the problem of evil. Certainly Whitman had none beyond a vigorous religious faith which holds that all things work together for good. This faith in a late poem he credits to Hegel.²⁶

²⁰*Song of Myself*, 41, 21: 1.

²¹*I Sing the Body Electric*, 79, 1: 7-8.

²²*Pioneers, O Pioneers*, 196, 18: 1-2.

²³*Song of Myself*, 74, 50: 4-6.

²⁴See the following poems: *Starting from Paumanok*, 15, 7: 4-7; 18, 12: 12-13; *Song of Myself*, 41, 21: 2-3; 42, 22: 42-46; *Crossing Brooklyn Ferry*, 137, 6: 6-21; *With Antecedents*, 204, 2: 5; *Song of the Universal*, 192, 2: 11-12; 193, 3: 4-7; *Roaming in Thought*, 233; *This Compost*, 309; *Song of Prudence*, 315: 49-50; *Chanting the Square Deific*, 370; *The Sleepers*, 361, 7: 40-44; *By Blue Ontario's Shore*, 373: 7; *Faces*, 387, 3: 7-12; *All is Truth*, 395: 7; *Song at Sunset*, 411: 57-58.

²⁵McTaggart, J. McT. E.: *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, pp. 34-35, and *Studies in Hegelian Dialectic*, chap v.

²⁶*Roaming in Thought*, 233.

Concerning the self as conceived by Hegel, McTaggart has the following to say:

Thus the nature of the self is sufficiently paradoxical. What does it include? Everything of which it is conscious. What does it exclude? Equally—everything of which it is conscious. What can it say is not inside it? Nothing. What can it say is not outside it? A single abstraction. And any attempt to remove the paradox destroys the self. For the two sides are inevitably connected. If we try to make it a distinct individual by separating it from all other things, it loses all content of which it can be conscious, and so loses the very individuality which we started by trying to preserve. If, on the other hand, we try to save its content by emphasizing the inclusion at the expense of the exclusion, then the consciousness vanishes, and, since the self has no content but the objects of which it is conscious, the content vanishes also.²⁷

It is through some such conception as this that Whitman is enabled to make about self the paradoxical assertions which abound in his poetry. At times he emphasizes one side of the paradox and at other times the other. In general, in his earlier poems it is the inclusiveness of the self that he likes to dwell upon.

"I resist anything better than my own diversity,"²⁸ he exclaims in *Song of Myself*, and then proceeds to catalogue several pages of objects and persons, including Christ, with whom he identifies himself. Continuing the idea, he says,

Do I contradict myself?
Very well, then, I contradict myself,
(I am large, I contain multitudes.)²⁹

This is the self that is master in its own right.³⁰ It enfolds orbs,³¹ wins victories over time,³² absorbs the material,³³ and triumphs over death. The self of Whitman, then, absorbs and identifies with it the not-self.

²⁷McTaggart: *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, p. 23.

²⁸*Song of Myself*, 38, 16: 20.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 75, 51: 6-8.

³⁰*Song of the Open Road*, 126, 5; *To You*, 199; 43.

³¹*Song of Myself*, 71, 46: 21.

³²*Ibid.*, 70, 46: 1.

³³*A Song of Joys*, 153: 96-102.

But Whitman saw that if the victories of the self were to be real victories, it must be matched against something more than mere phantoms. The not-self must be positive and real.

The earth is rude, silent, incomprehensible at first,
nature is rude, and incomprehensible at first.

Be not discouraged, keep on, there are divine things
well enveloped.³⁴

The world is not ours, it is not self, until we make it self.
In fact there could be no self without the not-self.

O the joy of my soul leaning poised on itself, receiving
identity through materials and loving them, observ-
ing characters, absorbing them,

My soul vibrating back to me, from sight, hearing, touch,
reason, articulation, comparison, memory, and the
like.³⁵

Again, he declares that

it is provided in the essence of things
that from any fruition of success, no matter what,
shall come forth something to make a greater
struggle necessary.³⁶

The necessity of eternal struggle by which the self conquers the not-self and converts it into self is for Whitman no more than for Browning an occasion for pessimism. Rather, it furnishes one of the keenest joys of life.

O while I live to be the ruler of life, not a slave,
To meet life as a powerful conqueror,
No fumes, no ennui, no more complaints or scornful
criticisms,

To these proud laws of the air, the water, and the ground
proving my interior soul impregnable,

And nothing exterior shall ever take command of me.³⁷

Thus "objects gross and the unseen soul are one."³⁸ The reasoning of this conception is implicit in the early poems.

³⁴*Song of the Open Road*, 128, 9:45.

³⁵*A Song of Joys*, 153, 11: 97-98.

³⁶*A Song of the Open Road*, 132, 14: 5.

³⁷*A Song of Joys*, 154: 133-146.

³⁸*A Song for Occupations*, 183, 5: 5.

Mine is no callous shell,
 I have instant conductors all over me whether I pass
 or stop,
 They seize every object and lead it harmlessly through
 me.³⁹

Air, soil, water, fire,—those are words,
 I myself am a word with them—my qualities interpen-
 trate with theirs.⁴⁰

The explanation is more explicit in a late poem, *Grand is the Seen* (1891).⁴¹ The “unseen soul” is thought of as “comprehending,” *i.e.*, making the not-self self, and “endowing,” *i.e.*, giving meaning, *i.e.*, reality, to the not-self. So that if the early lilacs became a part of the child,⁴² the child no less contributed something to the meaning, and hence to the reality, of the lilacs.

The doctrine that the self is the fundamental differentiation of the Absolute explains the tremendous emphasis that Whitman placed on self-hood. He asserts boldly,

I am the acme of things accomplished, and I am an encloser
 of things to be.

* * * * * * * *

For room to me the stars kept aside in their own rings,
 They sent influences to look after what was to hold me.⁴³

He takes the “exact dimensions of Jehovah,” “lithographs” Kronos, and carries other Gods in his portfolio.⁴⁴ He could also say with assurance,

Nothing, not God, is greater to one than one’s self is.⁴⁵

Such assertions as these are doubtless responsible for the charges of blattant egotism brought against Whitman. I suppose that anyone who publishes a poem has sufficient egotism to believe the poem worth publication. And one

³⁹*Song of Myself*, 48, 27: 4–6.

⁴⁰*Song of the Rolling Earth*, 186: 10–11.

⁴¹457.

⁴²*There was a Child Went Forth*, 306.

⁴³*Song of Myself*, 68, 44: 15; 69, 44: 27–28.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 63, 41: 8–12.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 73, 48: 3.

who hopes to sing the songs of a nation must believe himself endowed with some degree of talent, not to say genius. But this, in my judgment, is as far as Whitman's egotism extends (if we are to use the word in its popular signification). If the stars stayed aside in their circles for Walt Whitman,⁴⁶ the globe lay preparing quintillions of years for the slave.⁴⁷ And to the reader, whoever he may be, Whitman can say,

I only am he who places over you no master, owner,
better, God, beyond what waits intrinsically in
yourself.⁴⁸

This is indeed democracy. It is democracy, however, that need not obliterate all distinction. (Note the word *intrinsically* in the above quotation.) It is "that in respect to the absolute soul, there is in the possession of such by each single individual, something so transcendent, so incapable of production (like life), that to that extent, it places all beings on a common level."⁴⁹

If Whitman is here thinking of the individual as a fundamental and indispensable differentiation of the Absolute, he has a philosophic basis for the immortality of the soul, a doctrine which he repeatedly asserts without going into detail as to the sort of immortality he believes in.⁵⁰

Whitman's repeated assertions of the equality of man and God raise the interesting question as to what Whitman's conception of God was. The most direct expression of his conception is contained in *Chanting the Square Deific*, first published in 1865.⁵¹ The title of this poem is obviously defective, since "Santa Spirita" is described as one side of a square, yet greater than and including all the other sides.

⁴⁶*Song of Myself*, 69, 44: 27-28.

⁴⁷*I Sing the Body Electric*, 84, 7: 6-7.

⁴⁸*To You*, 198.

⁴⁹*Prose Works*, II, 77.

⁵⁰McTaggart (*Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, Chap. I) thinks human immortality a corollary to Hegelian Idealism. W. T. Stace (*The Philosophy of Hegel* (London, 1924), p. 514) doubts that Hegel believed in immortality "in its literal sense."

⁵¹370.

In accordance with his belief in the ultimate identity of good and evil, Whitman is, of course, expanding the Trinity to make room for Satan. I think, however, that it does not require a great deal of fancy to see in the poem a reflection of the Hegelian dialectic. Law, *i.e.*, necessity (described in the first stanza), is set against its antithesis, Mercy (described in the second stanza). The synthesis gives Good (not directly described in the poem), which is set against its antithesis, Evil; the new synthesis yielding God, the pervader and encloser of all life, and the correspondent of Hegel's Absolute Idea. Such a God need not have personality.⁵²

Thus far we have found striking agreement in the metaphysics of Whitman and Hegel. Aside, however, from the fact that both professed to accept modern science and to transcend it, there is little agreement in their theories of knowledge. Whether Hegel's categories are any less mind-made than Kant's, I shall not attempt to say. At any rate, he professed to prove by a rational system of logic⁵³ that ultimate reality is both determined and knowable.⁵⁴ To him philosophy was nothing more than a "reasoned apprehension of the Absolute."⁵⁵ In his theory of knowledge, Whitman is more nearly in agreement with Schelling and Emerson. He writes,

Wisdom is of the soul, is not susceptible of proof, is
its own proof,
Applies to all stages, and objects and qualities and is
content,

⁵²The interpreters of Hegel are divided on the question of the personality of the Absolute. For opposing views, see McTaggart and Calkins, respectively, in the works cited.

⁵³He is quoted by Caird (*Hegel*, p. 58) as saying: "If philosophy requires of the individual that he should lift himself into the ether of pure thought, on the other hand the individual has the right to demand of philosophy that it should let down a ladder on which he may ascend to this point of view; nay, that it show him that he has already this ladder in his own possession."

⁵⁴Calkins, Mary W.: *Persistent Problems in Philosophy* (New York, 1917), pp. 363 ff.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 390.

Is the certainty of the reality and immortality of
things, and the excellence of things;
Something there is in the float of the sight of things
that provokes it out of the soul.

Now I re-examine philosophies and religions,
They may prove well in lecture rooms, yet not prove
at all under the spacious clouds and along the land-
scape and flowing currents.⁵⁶

"Whatever satisfies the soul is truth," wrote Whitman in 1855,⁵⁷ and this position he never abandoned. Despite his enthusiastic praise of Hegel, he found in the latter's philosophy "compared with the lightning flashes of the old prophets . . . something cold, a failure to satisfy the deeper emotions of the soul—a want of living glow."⁵⁸ And in his proposed lecture on the German Idealists, he wrote, "It is true that no philosophy can, in the deepest analysis, explain the universe."⁵⁹ This statement might seem to imply that Whitman has examined the logic of Hegel and has found it specious. It is more likely, however, that he never mastered the Hegelian dialectic. Whitman could not have read the *Logic* in the original, and the expositions and extracts that were available to him before 1865⁶⁰ could not have furnished more than a fragmentary knowledge of the

⁵⁶*Song of the Open Road*, 127, 6: 11–16.

⁵⁷Preface to the 1855 edition of *Leaves of Grass*, Holloway, p. 504. This statement was afterwards incorporated in *Song of Prudence*, 315: 6.

⁵⁸*Prose Works*, I, 322.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, VI, 182.

⁶⁰I find no record of anything approaching a complete translation of the "shorter" *Logic* earlier than the first edition of Wallace, London, 1874. Various extracts from Hegel's works and expositions of his doctrines appeared in English during the fifties and sixties. Some of these, including translated extracts, appeared in the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, founded in St. Louis in 1867. The first edition of Stirling's *The Secret of Hegel*, containing a translation of the first book of the *Logic*, came out in London in 1865. See Calkins, *op. cit.*, "Bibliography," pp. 547–548, and Morgan, B. Q.: "A Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation," *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 16, Madison, 1922.

German philosopher. Then, too, whatever Hegel may have said about the philosophical ladder by which the individual is to ascend to the ether of pure thought, the fact remains that the average American mechanic cannot make the ascent by Hegel's ladder. This fact itself would prompt Whitman to prefer the mysticism of Emerson to the logic of Hegel. The Absolute, according to Whitman, is not to be found by a process of specious rationalization; it speaks directly to the souls of men.

Whitman, then, may rightly be termed a mystic if by mysticism is meant "those forms of speculative and religious thought which profess to attain immediate apprehension of the divine essence or the ultimate ground of existence."⁶¹ Like Browning, however, he desired to meet life "as a powerful conqueror,"⁶² and was free from that "passivity and asceticism"⁶³ that is usually associated with mysticism.

Whitman's world, like Hegel's, was superficially a world of contradiction and conflict; profoundly viewed it was a world of unity, but not one in which all practical distinction was leveled. Hegel professed to reach this conception of the universe by a process of logic; Whitman by spiritual intuition, a sort of insight that is inherent in every individual. Whitman's high praise of Hegel springs, I think, from an admiration of the end reached, and not from any critical appreciation of the means.

The question of when and how Whitman made his contact with Hegel remains to be considered.

To one who goes from the commonplace verse that Whitman wrote before 1854 to *Leaves of Grass*, there can be no doubt that Whitman experienced some sort of an awakening early in the fifties. Another fact equally patent is that Whitman at some time acquired at least a general knowledge of the tenets of Hegel. In 1871 he wrote,

⁶¹Pringle-Pattison, A. S.: "Mysticism," *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology* (ed. Baldwin), London and New York, 1902.

⁶²*A Song of Joys*, 154: 138.

⁶³Pringle-Pattison, *op. cit.*

Kant having studied and stated, Fichte and Schelling and Hegel.⁶⁴

Hegel is specifically credited with having suggested the basic idea of *Roaming in Thought*,⁶⁵ a poem assigned by Holloway to the year 1881. The prose works and the records of Traubel further testify to Whitman's knowledge of Hegel. The notes on Hegel published in *Specimen Days*⁶⁶ were written in 1882. Notes for a "Sunday evening lecture" on German metaphysics, published in the sixth volume of the prose works,⁶⁷ are assigned by the editors to the "late sixties or early seventies."⁶⁸ Traubel mentions as having taken place in 1888,⁶⁹ a conversation in which Whitman quoted Hegel. We may be sure, then, that Whitman knew something of Hegel by 1880 or before.

It is my belief that he made some acquaintance with him much earlier, probably as early as 1854. This conclusion is based on evidence summarized below.

At least one source of Whitman's knowledge of Hegel is not difficult to determine. In a footnote to the remarks on Hegel printed in *Specimen Days* and in the body of the lecture-notes referred to above, Whitman acknowledges his indebtedness to "Joseph Gostick." Though Whitman does not in either place cite the work by title, proof that he refers to Gostwick's *German Literature*, published in Philadelphia in 1854, is conclusive. His lecture-notes on the German Idealists read in part as follows:

"The heavens and the earth," to use the summing up of Gostick whose brief I endorse: "The heavens and the earth and all things within their compass—all events of history—the facts of the present and the developments of the future (such is the doctrine of Hegel)

⁶⁴*The Base of All Metaphysics*, 101.

⁶⁵233.

⁶⁶*Prose Works*, I, 318 ff.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, VI, 167 ff.

⁶⁸The grounds for this conjecture are not given. I suppose the assumption is that *The Base of All Metaphysics* (p. 101), 1871, alludes to these lecture notes.

⁶⁹*With Walt Whitman in Camden*, II, 540.

all form a complication, a succession of steps in the one eternal process of creative thought.⁷⁰

Gostwick's statement reads:

The heavens and the earth, and all things within their compass, all events in history, the facts of the present and the developments of the future, must be (according to Hegel's doctrine) only so many steps in one eternal process of creative thought.⁷¹

Among Whitman's notes on Frederick Schlegel are the following:

Wrote Philosophy of History, most valuable tenet of which is—"the inexpediency of destroying old institutions before new ideas are prepared to develop themselves in consistency with the order of society."⁷²

In Gostwick's *German Literature* occurs this sentence:

Perhaps the only valuable argument in these lectures [Schlegel's] is that which expresses the danger of "negative" reform; or, in other words, the inexpediency of destroying old institutions before new ideas are prepared to develop themselves in consistency with the order of society.⁷³

If further evidence that Whitman had access to the 1854 edition of Gostwick's *German Literature* is needed, it is to be found in the fact that he follows that edition in the spelling of the author's name, which appeared on the title page as Joseph *Gostick*, and not *Gostwick* as in later works.⁷⁴

The work, then, which forms an important source of Whitman's prose observations on Hegel was published as early as 1854. The supposition that he used it soon after this date is supported by the fact that, although in 1882 he praised Hegel with the extravagant enthusiasm of a disciple, saying among other things, that the "statement of G. F. Hegel probably remains the last and best word that

⁷⁰*Prose Works*, VI, 171-172.

⁷¹Gost(w)ick, Joseph: *German Literature* (Philadelphia, 1854), p. 269.

⁷²*Prose Works*, VI, 120, 121.

⁷³Pp. 278-279.

⁷⁴For instance, Gostwick and Harrison: *Outlines of German Literature*, Boston, 1873. See also (1) Morgan, B. Q.: *op. cit.*, p. 631, (2) index of the Library of Congress.

has been said to date,"⁷⁵ his later works show that Whitman made no material addition to his thought after 1855. There is perhaps a contraction of his metaphysical self, but this development involves only a slight shift in emphasis from one side of the Hegelian paradox to the other, and is to be ascribed to the natural conservatism of age. Youth emphasizes relatively more the inclusiveness of self, age its exclusiveness, but the fundamental conception is the same. It would seem, therefore, that if Whitman is indebted to Hegel at all, his influence must have been felt before the publication of *Leaves of Grass*.

If we bring together for purposes of comparison certain portions of Gostwick's discussion of Hegel, Whitman's notes on that discussion, and some of the poems appearing in the first and second editions of *Leaves of Grass*, we shall find additional support for this conclusion.

Though Gostwick does not dwell on Hegel's attitude toward science, the idea that philosophy must accept modern science and yet seek to transcend it is implicit in the following statement:

Kant explained the laws of understanding. But are these laws accordant with external truth and reality? Schelling and Hegel have endeavored to answer the question. The former professes to solve it by an appeal to a "spontaneous intuition," which discovers that the human mind and external nature are essentially one. . . . Hegel professes to solve the same question . . . in a more scientific style, by a method which he styles "absolute logic."⁷⁶

Whitman writes in *Specimen Days*, ". . . at any rate Hegel's system beams forth today, in its entirety, illuminating the thought of the universe and satisfying the mystery thereof of the human mind with a more consoling scientific assurance than any yet."⁷⁷ He goes on to speak of Hegelianism as "fully surcharged with modern scientism and facts."⁷⁸ These statements should be compared with a passage from *Song of Myself*:

⁷⁵*Prose Works*, I, 319.

⁷⁶Gostwick, Joseph, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

⁷⁷*Prose Works*, I, 320.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*

Hurrah for positive science! long live exact demonstration!
 Fetch stonecrop mixt with cedar and branches of lilacs,
 This is the lexicographer or chemist, this made a gram-
 mar of the old cartouches,
 These mariners put the ship through dangerous seas,
 This is the geologist and this works with scalpel, and
 this is a mathematician.
 Gentlemen, I receive you and attach and clasp hands
 with you,
 The facts are useful and real—they are not my dwelling—
 I enter by them to an area of the dwelling.⁷⁹

In his proposed lecture on German metaphysics Whitman has the following sentence:

As a face in a mirror we see the world of materials, nature with all its objects, processes, shows, reflecting the human spirit and by such reflection formulating, identifying, developing and proving it.⁸⁰

This is paralleled in *Song of the Rolling Earth* (1856) with

Sits she whom I too love like the rest, sits undisturbed,
 Holding in her hand what has the character of a mirror,
 her eyes glancing back from it,
 * * * * * * * *
 Holding a mirror day and night tirelessly before her
 face.⁸¹

Gostwick in his discussion of Hegel writes,

In conclusion, we may notice Hegel's statement, that his method cannot be opposed to any other mode of philosophy; "because it included all other modes."⁸²

In *Song of Myself* Whitman has,

I do not despise you priests, all time, the world over,
 My faith is the greatest of faiths and the least of
 faiths,
 Enclosing all worship ancient and modern and all between
 ancient and modern.⁸³

⁷⁹P. 43. I follow the reading of 1855, p. 565.

⁸⁰*Prose Works*, VI, 171.

⁸¹P. 188. I follow the reading of 1856, p. 630.

⁸²P. 272.

⁸³P. 66. I follow the reading of 1855, p. 578.

I think it unlikely that Whitman would have gone to his own poems for notes on an exposition of Hegel unless the poems were in some sense based on Hegel. It is more probable that the notes are earlier than has been thought or that the notes and the poems are based on studies earlier than either.

I have not attempted to show that Whitman was indebted to Gostwick for all he knew of Hegel's teachings. His notes on Hegel contain, indeed, among other topics, some biographical details not found in Gostwick's book. But I have endeavored to show that Whitman in preparing his notes on Hegel used a treatise which came off the press in 1854, and that the general similarity of the thought of the two, together with certain parallelisms between the notes and the earlier poems, at best suggests that Whitman knew something of Hegel before he published *Leaves of Grass*.

In his general reading Whitman probably found references to Hegel and with characteristic curiosity set about finding what he could about the German philosopher. At any rate, something, partially Emerson, I think, and partially a knowledge of the similarity of his own musings to the tenets of Hegelianism, strengthened Whitman's convictions and enabled him to write with confidence,

Now I know it is true, what I guess'd at,
What I guess'd at when I loaf'd on the grass,
What I guess'd while I lay alone in my bed,
And again as I walk'd the beach under the paling stars
of morning.⁸⁴

⁸⁴P. 51. I follow the reading of 1855, p. 571.



